

THE  
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

JUNE, 1854.

---

- ART. I.—1. *La Russie Contemporaine.* Par L. LEOUZON LE DUC. Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1853.  
2. *Progress of Russia, West, North, and South.* By DAVID URQUHART. London: Trübner and Co. 1853.  
3. *The Progress and present Position of Russia in the East.* London: Murray.  
4. *Annuaire de la Revue des Deux Mondes pour 1852-3.* Paris.  
5. *Geschichte des Russischen Reichs.* Von N. M. KARAMSKIN. 11 Bände. Leipzig. 1820-1833.  
6. *Religious History of the Slavonians.* By COUNT VALERIAN KRASINSKI. 1853.

ROME's providential mission was that of beating the nations into one. She inherited what Greece had done, in this respect, in the East, and accomplished the same task in Europe and in North Africa,—her iron grasp, and eminently legislative genius, consolidating into one mighty empire all the civilized, and some of the barbarous, nations of antiquity; so that when Caracalla conferred the right of citizenship on all the provinces, and Rome became the *patria communis*, it was the last easy step in a great process of assimilation which had been going on for ages. No national distinctions, no remembrances of livelong rivalry and hostility, no jealousy of races, remained to impede the spread of whatever principles of moral development and spiritual life could undertake the regeneration of men. Heathen Rome, indeed, perishing in its own social corruption, had no such principles to communicate to the world. The Gauls and Britons, in becoming

Romans, were at first but inoculated with the vices, as they were afterwards associated to the misfortunes, of their conquerors: but Jesus Christ was born half a century after the Roman legions reached the Rhine; and Christianity became the religion of the Cæsars, while the imperial territory was yet in its integrity. It was then time to put the great question, to which the history of the fifth and sixth centuries is the answer: This old world, now converted to Christianity, and continuing united under one sceptre,—is it to spread the blessings it has received among the rest of mankind by the simple attraction of its Christian civilization, and by the peaceful agency of missions? or is it to sink under the weight of accumulated evils, like the other great empires that preceded it, and make way for a new society? Alas! the kind of Christianity that rose upon the ruins of classical Paganism was itself too degenerate to save the worn-out populations that embraced it from the result of their hereditary vices, and of the social decomposition which these had engendered. Christianity consists in real and living relation to Jesus Christ; and every thing tending to obscure the consciousness of this relation, to render it less immediate and direct, or to weaken its supremacy, contributes, in the same degree, to deprive Christianity of its regenerating power over individuals and over society. The Jewish and Pagan elements, which, under the different forms of sacerdotalism, sacramentalism, hero-worship, and Pharisaic self-righteousness, had mixed themselves up with all the religious conceptions of the fourth century, left vitality enough in the Christian system to undertake the education of young unsophisticated races, full of native energy, but not enough to arrest the decline of the older races. The nominally Christian empire still remained Pagan in many of its traditions and institutions. It was under the influence of a brilliant literature, of written laws, and of the historical remembrances of ten centuries,—all anterior to its Christianity. Above all, the Emperors continued to inherit the original supremacy of the state over, not only the interests, but the consciences of the citizens. There was no adequate sense of individual dignity and individual right. Christianity certainly retarded the final catastrophe; it consoled and ennobled the last struggles of the Roman world. But the event proved it had been destined to find but a temporary shelter there, until the hardy tribes of Germany should be brought into contact with it, and, growing up under its influence, attain a higher civilization.

All subsequent history has justified the ways of Providence in this respect. The moral state and the fortunes of the Eastern Empire, during its long and ignoble agony of a thousand years, may be looked upon as a fair specimen of what all Christendom would have become, if there had been no timely barbarian conquests, and no infusion of young blood into the exhausted veins



of the Western Empire. Instead of diffusing Christianity by missionary labours, and recommending it by the spectacle of its own moral superiority, it would have preyed upon itself for ages; and at last, when the inevitable doom could no longer be averted, it would have proved, at its fall, too debilitated and corrupt to communicate its faith to the conquerors. The Barbarians, on the other hand, however imperfect the Christianity they met with, adopted it with all their might, and made it the central principle of their social culture. Their institutions grew up under its fostering hand, and their whole intellectual development was determined by what they knew of its doctrines. A spirit of native independence, and a high sense of personal dignity, uniting with the Christian feeling of the priceless value of every member of the human race, gave to their conceptions and to their activity a free and healthy tendency unknown to antiquity; and they understood that society was made for the benefit of man, taken individually, not man for society. Their low, materializing religion, with their hereditary violence and lawlessness, made, indeed, their progress painfully slow and irregular; yet they succeeded in working out the conditions in which modern society was to originate; and at last, at the blessed Reformation, they detected and corrected the degeneracy and corruptions of the form of Christianity under which they had lived. Of the somewhat more than ninety millions of Germanic origin, in Europe and America, above seventy millions profess the Reformed faith. Gaul, and the Spanish and Italian peninsulas, have retained their allegiance to Rome: the Latin element is predominant in their language, religion, and civilization. Yet those nations, too, have doubtless profited by their forced absorption of Franks, Burgundians, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and Lombards. On the whole, Divine Providence accomplished, through the sufferings and humiliations of the Western Romans, that work which might have connected itself with the prosperity and perpetuity of the empire, had they but been faithful to their mission; just as the partial dispersion of the Jewish people, during the ages that preceded the Christian era, had been the means of preparing the world for a coming redemption, which, but for their own fault, they might have wrought as a powerful and united people.

There is reason to believe, that if the Barbarians had not come to seek the Christian religion, it would never have been sent to them. Irenæus and Tertullian, indeed, both speak of Christian Churches in Germany before the close of the second century; the signatures of Bishops of Treves, Cologne, Laybach, and other places on the Rhine, and in the south, are found in the Decrees of Councils of the fourth century. Athanasius passed two years of exile at Treves, Jerome visited it, and Ambrose was born there; but there is no proof that the Gospel spread beyond

the frontiers of the empire in this part of the world. We hear of a Gothic Bishop, named Theophilus, who attended the Council of Nice, because there were Gothic armies fighting under the banner of Constantine; but the first really missionary labours among that people are attributed to Ulphilas, who made a beginning of German literature by inventing an alphabet, and translating the Psalms and the New Testament. Ulphilas's mission was, at least, partly involuntary; for he was the son of a Christian family at Cappadocia, carried into captivity by the Barbarians: and his Christianity was superficial; for, in A.D. 376, he passed over to Arianism, along with all his people, because that was the religion of the Court of Constantinople, and the Visigoths wanted protection against the Huns. The Ostrogoths borrowed Arianism from their kinsmen; the Burgundians and the Vandals followed their example. When Salvian wrote his book, *De Gubernatione Dei*, in the middle of the fifth century, the Germanic tribes were divided between Paganism and Arianism; so that all that the Romans had as yet done for them was the imposing upon a minority of them, by diplomatic means, of a spurious Christianity,—a Christianity without faith or love,—which, telling of no reconciliation, and feeling no need of it, could exercise no renewing and saving efficacy. It was only when the invaders came into daily contact with the popular Christianity of the West,—such as it was,—and with a Clergy free from the control of the Court, that the work of assimilation may be said to have fairly begun; and even then, as a general rule, the Preachers that displayed most activity, and met with most success, were themselves of barbarian origin.

The history of the gradual advance of a very imperfect Christian civilization over Central and Northern Europe, from the end of the fifth to the end of the fourteenth century, may be divided into three periods:—the Merovingian, the Carolingian, and that of the Crusades.

The Christians during the Merovingian period were just able to win back the ground that had been lost by the invasion. Ireland had embraced Christianity in the fifth century, and had escaped the calamities, and, in a great measure, the vices, of the Roman world. This hitherto almost unnoticed island furnished legions of Missionaries for the Continent, at a most important crisis. There seems to have been a natural affinity between the Celtic race and the Roman; half the great writers of Rome belonged to the Celtic provinces of Spain and Gaul; and now the island asylum of the Celtic race came to the rescue, and filled with her labours the interval between an expiring and a nascent civilization. Columbanus and St. Gall, with a host of followers and successors, cheered and exhorted the discouraged and demoralized Christians of Gaul and Burgundy. They evangelized the regions west of the Rhine,—the Allemanni of modern

Switzerland, the Lombards, and the Bavarians; and that with such success that, by the end of the seventh century, there had been established five bishoprics among the Bavarians, five among the Allemanni, and ten among the Franks of Austrasia,—regions, all of them, where Christianity had already prevailed, but from which it had been almost, or altogether, swept away by the inundation of Pagan races. After this, the missionary activity of the Irish declined; partly because, on account of their ecclesiastical independence, they were not encouraged by the Popes, and partly because it now became necessary to carry the Gospel into independent Germany itself, among those tribes who had never emigrated, and who were most accessible to Christian preachers of their own, or of a kindred, race.

The Anglo-Saxons occupy in the Carolingian period the place that the Irish had done in the Merovingian. The mission sent by Gregory the Great to the Saxons of England is an illustrious exception to the general inactivity of the original Christian Churches; but as soon as this energetic people was won over, Rome used their sons almost exclusively as Missionaries to the Germanic tribes of the Continent. The Saxons embraced Christianity with comparatively little difficulty, because they were away from the scenes of their sacred traditions. They had left their holy places and their gods behind them in the dark forests of their father-land; and they shared, with all the other emigrant Barbarian nations, a feeling of respect for the religion of the Romans, and aspirations after a something better than their fathers had known. Once converted, the Saxons showed peculiar gratitude and devotion to the See of Rome. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, in his "*History of the Reformation in England*," regrets that the British and Irish Churches not only failed in their attempts to induce the Saxons to adopt an attitude of ecclesiastical independence, but were also themselves obliged finally to succumb to the Papal supremacy. It cannot, however, be proved, that there was more real religious life among the Britons and Culdees than among their contemporaries; and since the great experiment of external material unity was to be tried in the Christian Church, it is well that it has been tried under the most favourable circumstances. If Rome led the nations to the utter demoralization of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,—if she so disgusted them with Christianity, that they were ready to throw it aside as a system of immorality and imposture,—it cannot be pretended that it was for want of opportunity to realize her ideal; for the whole of Central and Western Europe became one vast religious organization, subject to her spiritual sceptre, without one resisting people; while the East was then so unimportant and so isolated, that its resistance cannot be supposed to have counteracted whatever beneficial influences she could exercise in her own sphere.

During the eighth and ninth centuries, then, the Anglo-Saxons were the chief instruments at once of spreading Christianity on the Continent, and of increasing the authority of the Papal See. When, in the year 728, the Englishman Winfrid, on his second visit to the "eternal city," knelt before Gregory II. to receive the title of Bishop and the ecclesiastical name of Boniface, and was speedily sent off with a letter of recommendation to Charles Martel, that was a decisive moment for the new spiritual dominion of Rome. In 744, the influential monastery of Fulda was founded, like an advanced fortress, on the German soil. All those years we have important provincial councils held among the Austrasian Franks. In 740, Pope Zachary made Boniface Archbishop of Mayence, with jurisdiction over all Germany; and, in 752, Boniface anointed Pepin at Soissons,—a kind of consecration of Christian Kings which the Britons and Anglo-Saxons had borrowed from the Old Testament, but which had not hitherto been practised upon the Continent: it was the symbol of the alliance between the Church and political power. Several generations of Popes may be said to have leaned with one hand upon the sword of Charles Martel, Pepin, and Charlemagne, and with the other upon the crosier of the Saxon Missionaries,—a Boniface; a Willibrod, Apostle of the Frisons; and a Willehad, first Bishop of Bremen. At the same time, the most illustrious teachers of the Continent—an Alcuin and a Duns Scotus—were natives of the British Isles. It is but just to confess that the conversion of the Germans was not effected as exclusively by brute force as has been sometimes represented: the wars of Charlemagne—those terrible campaigns renewed at intervals during thirty-two years—were, in principle, defensive. The Emperor felt it was his calling to continue that of the Romans, and, at the head of his own civilized Barbarians, to put an end to all new barbaric invasions: it was to accomplish this that he subdued the countries from which new hostile emigrations were to be feared. The incursions of the Normans afterwards, however great their ravages, were, as M. Guizot observes, a symptom that the more formidable irruptions of the Barbarians by land had ceased for ever, and that the restless spirits of the still Pagan North could only gratify their love of adventure by pillaging coasts. The Normans who settled in France were Christians in the second generation; that is, at the beginning of the tenth century: they had lost their native idiom before the eleventh. Their conversion closes the period of strife with barbarism, properly so called. The British Isles, part of Spain, France, Germany, and Italy, were now incorporated into one religious organization; and the series of the Middle Ages could begin.

Thus the current of southern civilization first turned the Alps with Julius Cæsar. Checked, for a while, and refluxed before the

barbarian immigrations, it changed its character; and, purer than before,—however deeply sullied still,—and mightier than before, it resumed its course, westward and northward, never to be rolled back again. Ansgar, Archbishop of Hamburg, began the evangelization of Denmark and Sweden in 826; but it was not until after many vicissitudes, and a struggle of three centuries, that a Christian church, rising upon the ruins of the sacred temple of Upsal, sealed the final conversion of the Scandinavian nations; and, even then, Paganism still retained its hold upon some of the populations on the southern coast of the Baltic, and the Finlanders on the east. In 1168, the Island of Rugen, of dreadful celebrity for its human sacrifices, submitted to the arms of Waldemar I. of Denmark. The Finlanders had previously yielded to similar arguments, wielded by Eric IX. of Sweden; and their kinsmen, the Finnish races of Livonia and Esthonia, were dragooned into baptism, at the close of the century, by the military Order of the Knights Sword-Bearers, instituted by Pope Innocent III., whose apostleship was more selfish and oppressive than any of the others; for they even took possession of the lands of their converts, and reduced them to serfdom. The conquest of the Prussians by the Teutonic Knights, in the thirteenth century, closed this long series of warlike missions; and, in 1420, the last sacred grove on the borders of the Baltic was cut down: it was in the south of Courland. The sort of Christianity thus introduced was so superficial, that we find Albertus Magnus visiting the people of Pomerania, after their nominal conversion, to dissuade them from a bad habit they had retained,—of eating their aged relatives! Yet the idols disappeared: they were too hideous to be adopted by the Church, and their gory rites too horrible to be modified for its use. Moreover, the violent proselytism of the Middle Ages awakened, in the bosom of the vanquished, no such indignant protestation, no such sense of violated right, as we, with our education, might suppose. With the rude worshipper of Thor it was a simple question,—whose God was the strongest; and he submitted to the demonstration of the sword's point, as the evidence he was accustomed to offer for his own religion, and which, in his mind, was definitive. Had those religious wars been matter of unmingled hypocrisy, cruelty, and rapacity, humanity would have revolted against them: as it was, the subject populations ended by appropriating whatever degree of Christian knowledge and feeling the western world could give them. Many a Monk and Bishop preceded the march of the Christian armies, and fell victims to their zeal; others followed in the wake of the Crusaders, and did their utmost to teach the new converts. Religious instruction, in the proper sense of the word, was unknown to pagan antiquity. Even the initiated in the Mysteries heard but poetry: the old forms of nature and



hero-worship never trusted themselves to speak in prose, the language of analysis and sober reflection. The Christian Church, on the contrary, never sank so low as to neglect altogether the instruction of the people. Thus Charlemagne had no sooner conquered the Saxons, than the Council of Mayence, A.D. 813, made provision for preaching and catechizing in the vulgar German tongue.

Behind those many Germanic nations who filled the Centre and the North of Europe, another whole barbaric world came instinctively pressing towards the West. Its various and independent tribes, now known by the common name of Slavonians, spoke kindred dialects, and, like the Germans, recognised their relation to each other as members of one great family, though never united under the same Government, and often at war with each other. Those more oriental barbarians were destined to be attracted to Christianity in their invasions of the Eastern Empire, as the Germans had been in their invasions of Gaul and Italy. At the close of the seventh century, the Bulgarians, Servians, and Croats were masters of the regions south of the Danube, and extended their settlements to the Adriatic, where the Venedes, one branch of their race, had been established from remote antiquity. During part of the eighth century they even possessed ancient Greece itself; and the Slavonic term "Morea," by which they designated the Peloponnesus, dates from that time. In 810, they defeated the Emperor Nicephorus in a battle, which cost him his life. The Christian religion was introduced among them partly by Greek captives,—of whom the most illustrious was a Bishop of Adrianople, honoured with martyrdom,—and partly by prisoners and hostages of their own nation, who became Christians at Constantinople, and propagated their faith on their return to their people. The Bulgarian Prince Bogoris was baptized in the year 863.

Those Slavonians of the South were separated from the mass of their brethren by the Roumans, or Latinized Dacians, of the provinces now known by the names of Moldavia, Wallachia, and Transylvania; and by the Magyars, or Hungarians, a people who had immigrated from Asia, but whose language betrays their relationship to the Fins. North of this ethnological barrier lay the Slavonic countries of Great Moravia, Bohemia, and Poland; and then, far off to the east and north, the unorganized and uncivilized tribes whose descendants were one day to form the Empire of all the Russias. It seems that the people of Great Moravia, who had been already humbled by Charlemagne, began to wish to acquaint themselves with Christianity about the middle of the ninth century; and, either through jealousy of the Germans, or following the example of their brethren in the South, they turned their eyes towards Constantinople instead of Rome; and, in the year 863, their Prince, Radislav, sent an embassy to the



Emperor Michael III., to solicit a mission of learned and pious men to preach to his people and translate the Scriptures. The Emperor to whom he addressed himself was plunged in the grossest debauchery and impiety, one of his favourite amusements being to dress his buffoons and himself in the robes of the Patriarch and Clergy, and administer a mock sacrament in a compound of mustard and vinegar. The Empress-Mother, Theodora, however, showed herself capable of making a judicious selection for this important mission; and the Monks Methodius and Cyril, who had already laboured among the Bulgarians, and among the Khazars of the Crimea, were sent to Radislav. Cyril invented the Slavonic alphabet, and translated the Holy Scriptures; and, while the Romish Missionaries were accustomed to treat the barbarian languages as too profane to have divine service celebrated in them, the more enlightened and charitable Greek composed a Slavonic Liturgy for his new converts.

The great schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, though not yet finally and officially consummated, was then impending. It existed already morally; and the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople vied in their attempts to secure the allegiance of the Slavonians. A letter of the Patriarch Photius to Bogoris, and another of Nicolas I., are still extant; and it must be confessed that the Pope, though showing no indifference as to the supremacy of the chair of Peter, displayed far more desire for the spiritual advancement of the Bulgarians than his rival did, and far less predominance of the hierarchical over the moral element. He exhorted these rude neophytes against their remaining pagan superstitions, against laying too much stress on external observances, against their cruelty, and their infliction of the punishment of death for trifling causes; and he even disapproved of forcing men to profess Christianity. The Bulgarians and their other Slavonian brethren of the south hesitated, for a time, between the two communions; but, at last, the Emperor Basil the Macedonian, by the weight and vigour of his character, turned the scale in favour of Constantinople. The Moravians, on the contrary, ended by attaching themselves to the Western Church, and that with the concurrence of Methodius and Cyril, who seem to have set what they believed to be the religious advantage of their disciples higher than any considerations of personal sympathy and national prejudice. They went to Rome in the pontificate of Adrian I.; and Cyril ended his days in that city in monastic retirement. Methodius was appointed by the Pope Archbishop of the Moravians. We afterwards find him defending his Slavonic Liturgy before John VIII. from the complaints of the Roman Clergy, A.D. 879, and obtaining permission for its use, on condition that the Gospel should be first read in Latin.

At this time Bohemia was politically dependent on Moravia. Its Duke, Borziwori, was baptized before the close of the century; but it was not until after many vicissitudes that the Cross was finally triumphant. Borziwori's grandson, Wenceslav, a zealous Christian, was killed by his Pagan brother, Boleslav, in 938; but the murderer was afterwards himself converted; and Adalbert, Archbishop of Prague, finished the religious revolution of Bohemia. Christianity passed from thence into Poland. Duke Micislav, whose wife was a Bohemian Princess, was baptized in 966. The Poles were, from the first, docile and unhesitating subjects of the See of Rome. All their early literature is in Latin; and they had no succession of poets in their native tongue, like the Bohemians.

Hungary became Christian under the combined influence of the Greeks, the Bohemians, and the Germans. When Otho the Great beat the Magyars at Augsburg, in 955, he obliged them, by treaty, to receive Missionaries. About the same time, Gylas, a Magyar Chieftain, was baptized at Constantinople. The son-in-law of Gylas, Geisa, King of Hungary, favoured the German missions, which were especially active from 971 to 991, under the direction of Bishop Pilgrim of Passau. There followed a bloody reaction of the Pagan party, but it was their last; and Stephen, son of Geisa, who succeeded to the throne in 997, and was a great admirer of Adalbert of Prague, merited, by his zeal, the rank of patron saint of his native land.

Sometime about A.D. 860, a band of hardy Scandinavian adventurers, under Rurik, made themselves masters of the town of Novogorod, and established there the centre of a sovereignty which was soon afterwards transferred to Kiev, and which extended itself rapidly over the hitherto scattered and politically unconnected Slavonic populations of those regions. Strange coincidence, that pirates of the same nation, and nearly of the same age, should found settlements that were historically to form such a contrast as Novogorod and Normandy! The adventurers were called "Russians," from a Finnish term for the Scandinavians. The Greeks used to call the people that lived between the Dnieper and the Don, *Syromedes*, that is, "lizard-eyed," from the almond shape of the eye still observable in the native Russian; hence, by an easy corruption, the Latin *Sarmate*. In A.D. 900, the new state was powerful enough to send eighty thousand warriors in boats down the Dnieper, and over the Black Sea, to the gates of Constantinople, whence they returned with an immense booty. The intercourse thus begun was to terminate, as in so many similar instances, by the conversion and civilization of the Barbarians. In the middle of the tenth century the high-spirited, but cruel, Princess Olga undertook a journey to Constantinople, where she was baptized; the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus himself, in the character

of sponsor, leading her to the baptismal font, and giving her the name of Helen. She tried in vain to persuade her son to follow her example; but her grandson, Vladimir the Great, not only embraced the Christian religion externally, (A.D. 986,) but would seem to have done so from the heart, and to have honoured his profession by his life in a way that was very unusual with the political converts of this rude age. He extended and enriched his empire, established schools, adopted Cyril's Slavonic alphabet, and his translation of the Bible, encouraged arts and commerce, and was, in short, for Russia, what Alfred the Great had been for England just a century before.

Lithuania, placed between two Christian countries, hesitated long before it abandoned its idols. Olgherd, Grand Duke of Lithuania and part of Russia, in the fourteenth century, used to share in the Christian worship and build convents at Kiev, while at Wilna he still sacrificed to idols. He received Christian rites at his death, and Pagan at his burial! At last, in 1386, Jagellon professed Christianity, without mixture or reserve, in order to obtain the hand of the Princess Hedwiga, and the crown of Poland with it. The conversion of Lithuania added to the family of European Christian nations its last member. This people never decided in a body between the Eastern and Western Churches, and are to this day divided between the Catholics and the Greeks.

Unfortunately, Vladimir the Great divided his dominions among his twelve sons; and the same system of dismemberment was followed by his successors, entailing upon their people two centuries and a half of intestine wars, followed by two centuries and a half of cruel and humiliating subjection to the Tartars. The eleventh century was not one of complete barbarism. Yaroslaf was an eminent legislator. The counsels of Vladimir Monomach, bequeathed to his children, are said to be full of austere wisdom, pure morality, and Christian philosophy. This Monarch's contemporary, the Monk Nestor, wrote interesting chronicles: but the four centuries that followed are a complete blank in the intellectual, social, and moral history of Russia. Were it not for this long and dreary interval, Russia might perhaps have kept up with the rest of Europe, as it had already got the start of the nations round the Baltic; but while Europe was at the school of chivalry and the Crusades, treasuring up rich experience for future ages, developing its intelligence and resources, laying the foundation of our modern liberties, and preparing the whole framework of modern society, this unhappy people, on the contrary, retrograded rather under the influence of their own dissensions, and of Tartar tyranny. All the nations of the West had some popular literature, ballads, legends, &c., during the Middle Ages; while it is characteristic of Russia, that the only fragment of the kind which archæologists have been

able to detect, is one solitary piece of warlike poetry of the twelfth century.

Ivan III. Vassilievitch, who reigned from 1462 to 1505, married Sophia, niece of Constantine, the last of the Palæologi. At her instigation he threw off the Tartar yoke, took Kazan, and was solemnly crowned there. He also, after a siege of seven years, subdued Novogorod, whose inhabitants had erected themselves into a republic during the times of anarchy. Nearly all the principalities of Russia were united under his sceptre, and the work of centralization was completed by his son; so that the restoration of the Russian monarchy may be dated from his reign. It was contemporaneous with the consolidation of most of the continental monarchies,—with the reigns of Maximilian of Austria, Ferdinand of Spain, and Louis XI. of France. Thus the new empire rose into being, just as Constantinople had fallen into the hands of the Turks; and the marriage of Ivan with the Princess Sophia, the last of many similar alliances, gave the northern potentate in some sort the right to look upon himself as the representative of the Cæsars of the Eastern Empire, destined to be their successor and avenger. It was then that the double-headed eagle of Byzantium, holding a sceptre in one claw and the globe in another, became the emblem of Russia. Its older insignia, St. George and the Dragon, are still borne on a red shield on the eagle's breast.

This too rapid sketch of the progress of Christian civilization has brought us to the beginning of the sixteenth century,—that great epoch of transition at which it is fitting that we should pause, and take note of the aspect which Europe as a whole then presented. Taken *ethnologically*, the great mass of the inhabitants of Europe, then as now, consisted of three sections,—the Celto-Roman, the Germanic, and the Slavonic. The only change has been in their relative strength: they are nearly equal now, while, in the sixteenth century, the Germans were inferior in number to the Celto-Romans, and the Slavonians far inferior to the Germans. Taken *religiously*, the Russians, the Slavonians of the Danube, and the Greeks, formed one Christian communion of a very low standard of intelligence and piety; the southern portion struggling in vain against the advancing Crescent; the northern but just escaping, weakened and degraded, from the grasp of the Tartar; in both, the religious character almost confounded with the national, and the Clergy in helpless dependence upon the Crown. Central, Northern, and Western Europe, on the other hand, formed a more imposing religious unity, in which the Church was in a great measure independent of the civil power.

The expression of St. Paul, that "God sent his Son *when the fulness of the time was come*," (Gal. iv. 4,) authorizes us to draw from Scripture itself this great principle of the philosophy of

history,—that mankind collectively are at the school of God. Had Jesus Christ come earlier than he did, it would have been premature: the world was not yet ready for him; it had not yet the experience necessary to prepare it for the reception of the religion of redemption. It follows, then, that, besides the lessons learned by any one generation on its own account, there are others which become part of those hereditary acquisitions under the influence of which the rising generation grows up, and which form its character. There are periods in history at which it can be said of a race taken collectively, that it has profited by the experience of the past. Thus the Jews were radically and for ever cured of idolatry from the Babylonish Captivity onward. Thus, again, the nations of classical antiquity were only prepared for Christianity when they had fully tried their several religions, and worked out the principle of the kind of civilization to which they severally belonged. Like so many prodigal sons, they wandered away from God, and only came to themselves when they began to be in want. The monumental civilizations of ancient Babylon and Egypt, the arts and sciences of Greece, the conquering and self-assimilating genius of Rome, were all so many directions in which men tried to satisfy themselves without God; and the apathy, the weariness of life, the strange mixture of scepticism and monstrous superstition which characterized the generation in which Jesus Christ appeared, were symptoms of the utter failure of the last of those trials. Had man retained the integrity of his nature, his history would have been an even series of uninterrupted and happy progress: had man been abandoned of God, his history would have been one downward course of hopeless degradation, guilt, and misery; or, rather, there would have been no reprieve at all before the final catastrophe. But the actual history that we know is neither of these: it is the result of two factors,—man's tendencies on the one hand,—the controlling and correcting compassions of God on the other. Sin has changed human progress into a conflict: it is still progress, but irregular, interrupted, and attended with fearful suffering; so that any given phase of civilization is not what the Divine Will would have produced in the abstract, but what it has produced when acting on resisting and antagonistic elements. Each phase exhibits at the same time ideas and institutions which are really acquisitions, and are transmitted as such to future ages; and ideas and institutions which are aberrations, and have only been permitted to come into existence that future ages might learn not to repeat the error.

Taking these general considerations along with us, and contemplating the vast religious confederacy which embraced Central and Western Europe in the Middle Ages, we feel we are in presence of a great providential training-period in the history of mankind. It was a period which laid deep and durable founda-



tions for future good, and developed, at the same time, gigantic forms of evil, as a warning for future generations. The old Roman world had been unable to conceive any other unity among men but that of a material political organization, while every province retained its peculiar traditional deities. The Middle Ages, under the influence of Christianity, began to understand the supremacy of the spiritual principle, and sought for unity in the possession of a common religious organization, and common forms of worship, while admitting of variety in social and political institutions; thus forming the transition to the higher and freer conception of modern Protestantism,—unity in the possession of a common faith and spiritual life, admitting of variety in forms of worship and of ecclesiastical organization. The civil despotism of the Middle Ages was to pass away as soon as it had tamed the lawless barbarian temper, leaving behind it our modern liberties, and the habit of exercising them, though in very different degrees of development in the several nations which have grown out of feudal society. The yoke of the priesthood was to be broken as soon as their agency had become more powerful for evil than for good; and the personal religion of the Reformation succeeded the selfish spiritual despotism of the Pope. In short, the Middle Ages were the preparation—partly positive, and partly negative—for all the good that it was in the purpose of God to bestow upon mankind. The destinies of the world were to issue from the providential training of the nations belonging to the Western Church.

On the other hand, when we turn to the Russians, and their co-religionists in the South-east of Europe, a spectacle altogether dissimilar is presented to us. Our Middle Ages, with whatever of good or evil they have bequeathed to the future, did not exist for Russia. The providential education of the eastern third of Europe has been of quite a different character from that of the other two-thirds: its history has been far less diversified, its experience less complete, its energies less called into exercise. This original and essential difference is the secret of most of the contrasts that strike even the least attentive observers. Great as is the present antagonism between Papal and Protestant Europe, they have not only remembrances, but even present elements, in common, which are wanting in Russia. The spirit of chivalry, for instance, never existed among this people, who had no share in the Crusades. They have never fought, except for material advantages. No people in the world exchange more readily the civil for the military life: and yet they have but a faint idea of military honour. With the religion of the Greeks they borrowed the morals, the political maxims, the cunning and bad faith of degenerate Constantinople. Hence the striking disproportion between the ability displayed by the Russians in diplomacy, and that which they exhibit in literature and in the



arts. There is not that feeling of personal dignity, that respect for individual rights, which prevails, comparatively at least, in the rest of Europe, and puts forth its claims even where it is violated. Again, while through all our modern history there has been a gradual advance from one degree of civil liberty to another, Russian history, as we shall see, registers a gradual diminution of the liberty of the subject for the last three centuries. Religion with us is more and more a matter of personal conviction, leading to free personal activity in its diffusion: religion with the Russian is a mere instinct, a part of his national feeling, which he never thinks of communicating to others, unless they are brought under the sway of the same sceptre.

The question naturally presents itself, Are some of those failings to be referred to an original inferiority in the Slavonic race, rather than to historical causes? Perhaps so, in some small measure. There would seem to exist less hardihood, less native independence and moral energy, among the Slavonians, especially the eastern part of them, than among the Germans. It has been remarked, that the leaders and Princes of Slavonic nations have been very generally men belonging to other races: the present Russian Nobles, it is said, are, most of them, like their Sovereign, of foreign origin: and it may be doubted whether any German tribe, placed in the situation of the Russian peasants, would have submitted to the gradual extinction of their rights as freemen. There is a want of order in the character of all the Slavonic nations; and Independent Poland was not only cursed with serfdom, but also with a venality, on the part of public functionaries, equal, perhaps, to that of her present oppressors. However, there can be no doubt that the servile character of the civilization imported from the degenerate Greek Empire, and the debasing influence of long subjection to the Tartars, have been far greater causes of Russian inferiority than any original defects of temperament. The Slavonians of Poland and Bohemia, who bore their part in the history of the Middle Ages, and were incorporated into feudal civilization, showed themselves, in most respects, equal to the rest of Europe: no people were more eminent in literature, or more chivalrous in war. The Emperor Charles IV., in his Golden Bull of 1336, made the Tchek the diplomatic language of Germany. The western members of the Slavonian family bade fair, for a time, to rival, if not to outstrip, the Germans in the work of religious reformation. The influence of the Waldenses was felt in Bohemia and Moravia before the fourteenth century; Wickliffe's works were spread in both countries, and his followers found a refuge there; John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, were the noble fore-runners of the Reformers in both their labours and their martyrdom. Unfortunately, the religious movement of the fifteenth

and sixteenth centuries in Bohemia was overlaid by the political one. The Tcheks made the principles of Huss a pretext for a struggle to maintain their nationality against German usurpations; but this secularization of a religious cause, though rendering it popular for a time, made its influence superficial, and was the occasion of its ruin. The religion, the nationality, and the constitutional liberties of Bohemia perished all together on the fatal field of Weissenberg, in 1620; and so little rooted was mere political religion, that, fifteen years afterwards, the whole kingdom was, in appearance at least, Roman Catholic.

The history of Poland, with an equally disastrous termination, exhibits at least equal proofs of this country's participation in the common political and religious life of Central and Western Europe. Except a Hymn to the Virgin, the oldest remnant of Polish literature extant is a little poem in honour of Wickliffe, written about the middle of the fifteenth century. The Letters of Bernard of Lublin to Simon of Cracow anticipated Luther's Theses by two years. The great progress of the Reformation in Poland during the following century is known to every well-informed person; but the spread of Socinianism on the one hand, and the excessive intolerance and superstition of the Lutherans on the other, too soon marred this fair prospect:—men shrank from the hollow Deism of the one party, and the dry dogmatism of the other; the Jesuits got possession of the Court; the Nobles showed themselves, as Nobles in most countries do, slavishly dependent on the Court in matters of religion; and the petty Nobles had not the independence with which our middle classes would have resisted such influences.

The geographical situation of the Slavonic races should invite them to act as mediators between the East and the West, appropriating the civilization of Europe, and transmitting it to Asia. Their eminently cosmopolitan character is peculiarly fitted for such a mission: the oldest Slavonian codes put the *gast*, or "stranger," on a level with the native; they are naturally at once the most hospitable and the most imitative of mankind. Old Poland, with its ever-shifting frontiers, instinctively aimed at a universal Slavonian Confederation, on the principle of free association; and the Polish mind exhibited, for a time, a religious tolerance, and a respect for the nationality of other populations, greater than was felt elsewhere. But the weakness of the Crown having left the peasants without their natural protector, they were reduced to serfdom; and when the Jesuits directed the conscience and the counsels of Sigismund III., this Monarch, fatally untrue to the national instinct of tolerance, persecuted the Greeks of Lithuania, and alienated for ever the minds of the Russians, at a time when Russia might otherwise have been easily annexed to Poland. We may venture to say, that a great opportunity for the whole Slavonic race, and for the world, was

lost through the influence of the Jesuits over Sigismund III. at the beginning of the seventeenth century; for if the stream of civilization had continued to pursue the course it had followed since the days of Clovis, Poland would have made herself mistress of Russia. She was qualified to do so by the attraction which a higher civilization exercises; and, at the period alluded to, the task would have been rendered singularly easy by the circumstances of Russia. The family of Rurik had become extinct, and a succession of usurpers struggled for the crown. The armies of Sigismund occupied Moscow in 1610; and the Russians, wearied by internal anarchy, and by the attacks of the Swedes, would probably have allowed themselves to be incorporated with a kindred people, if they had not seen in Sigismund the enemy of their religion, the persecutor of their Lithuanian brethren. So the patriot peasant Minin and Prince Pojarski roused their countrymen to a desperate effort: the Poles were expelled; and Russia, instead of an instrument of European influences, became a barrier against them, as she remains to this day: nay, she has conquered Poland in her turn, and presses upon Germany.

Without speculating upon what would be the present state of the world, if Poland had become Protestant, and Russia Polish, let us retrace the steps by which Russia has been gradually brought to become what she is, politically, socially, and morally.

The original state of the Sarmatian people seems to have been one of barbarian liberty and equality. Indeed, the peasant still says "thee" and "thou" to every body, which gives his language a tone of patriarchal simplicity, augmented, perhaps, by the expressions of endearment with which it abounds, as, "my heart," "my life," "my dove." After the reign of Rurik and his Varangians, the descendants of the first adventurers acquired a sort of nobility, or hereditary superiority, which, however, still left the Russian peasant a freeman. The long tyranny of the Tartars made the next advance towards the present social state. The peasant became accustomed to look upon himself as born to labour for others. His immediate taskmasters were the Nobles of his own country, who, paying tribute to the Asiatic invaders, were established in the exercise of despotic powers in order to be the better able to exact it. When the Tartar yoke was thrown off, it was practically an emancipation of the Czar and the nobles merely, while the condition of the peasantry did not change. It was still, however, more tolerable than it is now; and the poor people, in the joy of their release from the thralldom of the stranger and the infidel, did not perceive that their superiors alone profited by it. The reign of Ivan IV., justly called "the Terrible,"—a contemporary of Queen Elizabeth, and who made a treaty of commerce with England,—was a new epoch in the progress of despotism. The citizens of Novogorod the

Great, who sighed for their old freedom, and still retained certain democratic institutions, were suspected of conspiring to surrender the city and surrounding territory into the hands of the King of Poland. Ivan took this devoted city in 1570, razed it to the ground, and butchered twenty-five thousand of its inhabitants in cold blood: its franchises were done away with for ever; and the bell that used to summon the *Vetche*, or popular assembly of the only free city in the empire, has been silent for well-nigh three centuries. During this reign, also, took place the first encounter between the Turks and the Russians. The Sultan, Selim II., ordered a canal to be cut between the Don and the Wolga; but wild-looking men, issuing from the woods, cut his workmen to pieces:—they were the soldiers of Ivan the Terrible.

The dynasty of Rurik became extinct in 1598; and Boris Godunof, a man of great wealth and energy, whose sister had married the last representative of the imperial family, managed to become its successor. During his brother-in-law's life, Boris had rivetted the chains of the peasants by depriving them of the right of changing lands and lords, if they pleased, on St. George's Day,—a privilege which they had hitherto enjoyed. This fatal measure may be considered as the establishment of serfdom, properly so called. The peasant was henceforth tied to the soil, bought and sold along with it, and unable to escape from a cruel master when he had the misfortune to find one. It coincided chronologically with the accession of the Stuarts to the throne of England; so that the century which was to witness the consecration of Englishmen's dearest liberties, began by the confiscation of the last liberties of the Russian people. What an opportunity, indeed, that was for Poland, if the spirit of aristocracy and the influence of the Jesuits had not hindered her from profiting by it, and rousing the Russian serf to fight for freedom!

Boris Godunof felt the necessity of surrounding his newly-acquired power with every possible *prestige*. He was the first to assume the title of Czar, the Russian corruption of *Cæsar*. He promulgated a prayer, which the head of every family was to repeat before their meals: "My God, we pray for the health of the body and soul of Boris, our Czar; the only Christian Monarch of the universe, whom other Sovereigns serve as slaves, whose mind is a deep of wisdom, and whose heart is full of love and magnanimity." The whole tendency of Czarism is breathed in this prayer; which, while appealing to the natural tendency of the Russian mind to King-worship, at the same time artfully flattered the sort of pride which belongs to half-savage nations, and made the Czar, in some sort, the representative of the superiority of his people. It is to be feared this prayer was intended to produce effect on earth, rather than to be heard in heaven;

but the adoption of such a device for making the royal person an object of superstitious reverence, proves the existence of a peculiar cast of thought in the people whom it was intended to influence. The Russian is distinguished by an instinct of veneration and a natural religiousness,—precious qualities indeed, if they had not been abused into servility and superstition. The low mechanical sort of religion he had learned from the Greeks, and the perpetual struggle for existence in which he found himself engaged with Tartar and Turk, combined to make his religion and his patriotism one feeling; to absorb the religious in the national character, and, at last,—since in Asiatic fashion the Ruler is the nation,—to put at the disposal of his political Ruler the deep-seated and enduring impulses which properly belong to the religious principle. “The God of the Russians is great,” is a proverb which exhibits this feeling. More characteristic still is the expression, “Holy Russia,” which embodies the popular conception of the national calling to be the all-conquering orthodox people.

These arts did not prolong Boris’s reign, or secure the crown for his family. But when, after several years of anarchy, the first Romanof was elected Czar, in 1613, by almost general consent, he and his descendants continued to use the theocratic language which was so well suited to the temper of their subjects. “You,” said Peter the Great, in a Manifesto against the Shah of Persia, whom he was about to attack most unjustly,—“You, and you alone, will be to blame for this, and will have to answer for it at the second coming of the Lord our God.” Peter brought the system to perfection by assuming, in 1702, the religious as well as political supremacy over his people,—making himself at once the Pope and the Autocrat of all the Russias. This bold step was facilitated by the subserviency toward the civil power, in which the Russian Church, like its Greek parent, had always been maintained; it concentrated upon the person of the Emperor, without a rival, the strongest feelings of respect and devotedness of which human nature is capable. Yet the usurpation was not effected altogether without opposition: some of the Clergy and peasantry called the Czar “Antichrist,” and founded the sect of the *Starovers*, or “Old Believers,” who dissent from the National Church on this ground. This sect, though constantly kept in a state of depression, was too numerous to be exterminated: it is supposed now to amount to five millions of souls, chiefly, we believe, in Little Russia. The Government tried to put an end to its existence by interrupting the apostolical succession of its Priesthood; the Priests who adhered to the sect being seized, formed into regiments, and sent to die of ague in Lankaran, on the Caspian; but this purpose has been defeated by the protection of the Sultan; for, since 1846, Greek Bishops at Constantinople confer



imposition of hands on the persons sent to them by the Starowers. The essential difference between the Old Believers and the National Church has led to minor details of controversy, in which the wretchedly low conceptions of both parties are but too plainly revealed: thus, one of the matters eagerly agitated is, whether the priestly benediction with two fingers is valid, or whether it should be bestowed with three fingers! At the bottom of these puerile controversies there exists a persevering instinct of religious independence, which, in some day of distress, may render the Starowers a revolutionary power, dangerous to the stability of the whole Russian system. Some minor sectaries expect the coming of an ideal Prince, whom they call "the White Czar;" and in 1812 they thought that Napoleon was the lion of the valley of Jehoshaphat, coming to dethrone the false Emperor, and prepare the way of the White Czar. They actually sent Napoleon a deputation, but it did not reach him. The fugitive Cossacks, who have two settlements in Asia Minor, —one from the time of Mazeppa's alliance with Charles XII., and the other from the time of Catherine II.,—belong both of them to the sect of the Starowers, and entertain correspondence with their co-religionists within the Russian frontier.

The extraordinary labours of Peter the Great to raise Russia in the scale of material civilization, are known to every body. He found the empire with one solitary port, Archangel, free from ice some three months in the year: he left it with a magnificent capital opening on the Gulf of Finland. He organized an army, created a navy, established a regular administration, fostered the arts, made canals, instituted posts, and invented an alphabet. This last fact requires explanation; for it is, at first sight, almost inconceivable, that a great people, converted to Christianity for eight centuries, should have had no alphabet until 1704. Such a fact is a revelation of the state of Russian culture, up to the time of Peter, which requires no comment. It appears that the old Slavonic of Cyril and Methodius still remained the language of the Bible and the Liturgy, while it had gradually gone out of use in ordinary life; or, rather, it had never been exactly the colloquial language of the great majority of the populations of Russia, who spoke various dialects related to one another, and to the Slavonic, but which were illustrated by no literary productions, and which it had never been attempted to reduce to unity and order. Peter suppressed nine of the forty-three Slavonic letters, and so far modified the dead language, by rules taken from the chief living dialects, as to lay a fixed basis for the modern Russian tongue, and make it capable of the improvements it has since received. Lomonosof, a fisherman of Archangel, was the author of the first Russian Grammar. Prince Kantemir, a descendant of Genghis Khan, Ambassador at London in 1732, and at Paris in 1738, a friend



of Montesquieu, was the first native writer of any eminence. He excelled in satire, for which his nation seems to have a peculiar genius. The only other literary character of the eighteenth century was Derjavin, a Tartar soldier from Kazan, whose lyric poetry is of a high order, and very original. He was an admirer of the Empress Catherine II.

The great drawback upon Peter's labours is, that he himself remained a barbarian in the midst of the appliances of civilization. While instinctively forestalling the famous phrase, "Knowledge is power," he showed himself incapable of understanding that higher power of self-restraint,—that moral superiority,—without which knowledge is but power in hands that are unworthy of it. The Monarch who could spend weeks together in the lowest debauchery, and with the lowest associates; who was at once tyrant, drunkard, and buffoon; who could let loose live bears in a masquerade at his fool's wedding, and cut off with his own hand the heads of a score of rebellious Strelitz, quaffing off a cup of wine between every victim;—such a man was still a savage at bottom, and incapable of appreciating the real principle of civilization. He could value the various processes by which men acquire empire over nature; he could value the knowledge of facts, as such, and facilitate its communication; but he remained a stranger to a whole order of ideas and feelings in which the rest of Europe had grown up, and which were so early instilled into every successive generation, as to appear innate and hereditary. Were it not for this, he would have devoted his prodigious energies to raise his people morally, instead of merely borrowing the arts and copying the external civilization of other nations: his reform would have proceeded from *within*, and been thorough, instead of coming from *without*, and remaining superficial. As it was, his own character, with all its contrasts, became the emblem of the Russian people. The system which he began has been developed by his successors. In some respects, indeed, there has been progress; a national literature, for instance, has begun to replace translations from foreigners; but, on the whole, Russia is what Peter made it,—a society under perpetual martial law, with the discipline of a camp instead of the order of a state, the people enregimented without being educated, modern administrative experience serving oriental despotism, the extremes of natural barbarism and imported civilization elbowing each other at every turn; and the immorality, venality, servility, and mendacity of all ranks justifying the terrible sentence of Diderot, that "Russia was a fruit which had rotted before ripening." Russia passed at one bound from childhood to artificial manhood: the impatience of her Monarchs deprived her of the lessons of adolescence, of the deep fermentation of slow and natural civilization. It taught her to live for appearances, to impose upon the world

by the spectacle of her power, and of her imitations of European culture, without troubling herself about the degraded condition of the mass of her population, and the low moral standard of all.

Peter ordered his Nobles to give balls at St. Petersburg, and he made a decree to oblige their wives and daughters to appear at them, and abandon their Asiatic seclusion. Such sovereign cares may excite a smile; but, be it remembered, they were the beginning of a minute inquisitorial tyranny, in which the Czars have continued to indulge, and from the stifling grasp of which no domestic privacy is safe. The habits of Western Europe, and the German functionaries introduced by Peter, wounded the national feeling of the great body of the Russians; and the struggle between the national and foreign element was, as it were, personified in that between the Czar himself and his son Alexis, who, after flying from the empire, returned, was thrown into prison, and poisoned there. Peter vanquished the resistance of the old Muscovites; but, instead of looking upon his despotism as a necessary evil, which should be softened down in future generations, as society got less rude, he took every precaution to render it perpetual. Up to his time, the ukases began with this formula, "The great Prince has ordained: the Boyards have approved." He suppressed it; he would not even leave the Boyards the semblance of a political right. Of course, since one mind is not able to go through the business of an immense empire, it is necessary that there should be a Senate, and governmental departments of all sorts; but the will of the Autocrat is supreme and uncontrolled. The only means by which the Boyards can exercise an influence upon the affairs of state, is through the comparative facility which their access to the person of the Sovereign affords them of using poison or the dagger; and modern Russian history presents us with tragedies which the rest of Europe has not heard of since the Middle Ages, almost justifying M. de Custine's definition, "An absolute monarchy, tempered by assassination." A body of nobility, who have no voice in the affairs of their country, are necessarily dissipated; they are driven to debauchery and prodigality by very weariness at St. Petersburg now, like those of Venice once. Hence the proprietors of Russia have been accumulating debts for several generations, with a recklessness unknown in other countries. Catherine II., in order to save them from the clutches of private usurers, founded a state bank, in which money is lent to them at eight *per cent*. By this means their property falls rapidly into the hands of Government: the Crown now possesses half the lands of the empire, if we are to judge by the number of its serfs, which is nearly equal to that of all the other proprietors put together; so that Russia is making giant strides towards the Socialist ideal of—the state the uni-

versal land-owner. One human being Autocrat, Pontiff, and landlord of all the Russias! What a prospect for those who admire authority! It is no wonder that the high reactionary aristocracy of Germany should openly express their sympathy for the Czar at the present crisis, under the influence of the same morbid feeling which makes some of them every day turn Papists or Irvingites.

For the still greater centralization of power, all the free members of society were distributed by Peter into fourteen classes, the civil and military hierarchies corresponding to each other, and rank throughout the empire being determined by the class assigned to each individual in this vast organization, which begins with the Field-Marshal and the Patriarch, and ends with the Ensign and the Sexton. Between the Nobles and the serfs there is an intermediate class, the burgesses of towns, divided into three guilds: the first consists of burgesses who have £8,000 capital and upwards; the second, of those who have £3,200; the third, £1,280. The members of the first two guilds may ride in a carriage with two horses, and they are exempt from corporal chastisement; the members of the third may not aspire to more than a one-horse carriage, and may be caned and knouted at pleasure. All three may have houses of their own, and even gardens; but they cannot buy land with serfs upon it.

It is evident, that a country in the circumstances of Russia under Peter the Great, could borrow the military arts of the civilized world more easily than any other; indeed, a semi-barbarous people, when disciplined, are, in many respects, more formidable in war than more advanced races. Large armies can be more easily levied and supported; the wants of the soldier are fewer, and he sets lightly by his own life and that of others. Russia, upon assuming her rank among the powers of Europe, found herself capable of exercising, by mere physical strength, far greater influence than she would have been entitled to from any other consideration. It was natural, therefore, that she should bestow especial attention on the only sphere in which she could successfully compete with other nations, and that she should become an essentially military power. This tendency was increased by a great many causes. The disposition to extend oneself at the expense of others, and neglect internal improvement for foreign conquest, is not extinct in the more highly civilized nations; but it does certainly prevail to a greater extent among the less civilized. A spirit of restless agitation is the character of all northern nations in particular, unless where serious religious development and domestic comfort attach them to their home. The Russian peasant has instincts not altogether unrelated to those of the Tartar who oppressed him once: the thought of more fertile and sunny regions gleams betimes across his generally apathetic mind,

inspiring a vague desire to visit and possess them. He does not attach himself to his monotonous plains, forests, and marshes, like the inhabitants of regions of more strongly marked and varied character: his patriotism concerns itself with the language, the religion, and the customs of his people, rather than with the land they live in, and can readily resign itself to emigration. Again: hereditary strife with Sweden, Poland, and Turkey had assumed a religious character, and accustomed the Russian soldier to shoulder his musket with deeper feelings than those of national antagonism. Let us add, that the state of all the neighbouring countries was such as might tempt a more highly-principled Court than that of St. Petersburg to turn to account their dissensions, and their many elements of internal weakness, by timely alternations of intrigue and force.

All these causes combined prepared Russia to be an invading people, ever ready to seize the opportunity of aggrandizement, and retaining the prey that it had once seized with the tenacity of the Maelstrom. It is now the only people of Europe which retains the theory and the practice of conquest, while experience has taught all the others to give it up, and reciprocally respect their several national existences. Peter showed his successors, by his example, the directions in which they were to march on the career of systematic aggression which his daring, inhuman, and unscrupulous genius traced out for them. He planned the expulsion of the Turks from Europe, though he was himself signally defeated by them, and driven behind the Dnieper; he commanded the Caspian by a fleet, his influence and alliances extended to the banks of the Indus, and he got possession of a considerable part of Persia, though it was soon retaken by the vigorous conduct of Nadir Shah; in the North he wrested Ingria, Livonia, and Esthonia from Sweden, inflicting the first serious wound on the power of that noble people. The foundation of St. Petersburg embodied at once all his thoughts, his purposes, and his faults. It was the triumph of his self-love over the independence of the old Muscovites who wished to resist his innovations: it inaugurated the naval power of a great continental people finding its way to the ocean: its costly edifices, built with Grecian and Roman colonnades, so unlike the national architecture of the Kremlin, and so unsuited to a country of level plains and undefined horizons, were a fit expression of an artificial civilization that had no roots in the soil. At the same time a capital built upon ground won from Sweden was the proudest emblem that could be devised of the vast and persevering ambition that premeditated raising its greatness upon the spoils of the world. It was a trophy prophetic of the future power of Russia, and, from its erection onward, Princes and people have been planning for the future, while the other nations of Europe have been living for the present.

Strange coincidence ! it is to the United States that one must go to find equal pre-occupation about the future, and equal susceptibility on the score of national institutions.

Of all the successors of Peter the Great, Catherine II. trod most completely in his steps ; whether we consider the vices of her private life, or her boundless ambition, military triumphs, and diplomatic dexterity. This reign of thirty-four years witnessed the two dismemberments of Poland, the first permanent footing gained south of Caucasus,—when Heraclius, Sovereign of Georgia, Imeretia, and Mingrelia, was inveigled into recognising himself the vassal of Russia,—two successful wars with Turkey, the annexation of the Crimea, and the advance of the south-west frontier first to the Bogue, and then to the Dniester. That is to say, she augmented the empire by several millions of souls, and by territories larger than France or than the Austrian Empire. Catherine may be said to have settled and perfected the successive processes by which independent states, or the provinces of other empires, were henceforth to be incorporated with Russia. The formula is well defined by Sir John M'Neil to be the following : first, *disorganization* by means of corruption and secret agency ; next in order, *military occupation*, to restore tranquillity ; then *protection*, followed by *incorporation*. Her first war with Turkey was remarkable for the first great victory of the Russian navy, in the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Tchesme by Alexis Orloff, under the direction of an English officer, Admiral Greig. This war was undertaken by the Porte, in 1769, essentially to procure the evacuation of Poland. The war of 1787 was the result of a secret arrangement with the Emperor Joseph II. of Austria, for the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire ; and Egypt was offered to France, if she would join in the project ; but it was defeated by the interposition of England and Prussia. On this occasion, the idea of disturbing the British Empire in India was seriously entertained at St. Petersburg. Prince Nassau Siegen drew up a project for the march of an army, through Bokhara and Cashmere, to Bengal ; and the scheme has never been forgotten in Russia : the sacrifices of blood and treasure which have secured her trans-Caucasian provinces, must have been made for some greater end than the simple possession of those costly appendages to the empire.

The work which Peter had begun, of subduing the Cossacks, and making their very habits of wild independence subserve the strength of the empire, was completed by Catherine. Those communities of hardy borderers had gradually formed themselves in the Ukraine. The love of independence had early attracted into the unpeopled regions between Russia and Poland fugitive peasants,—criminals betimes,—the bolder and discontented spirits who would own the authority of neither country.



They sought protection from each, alternately, when the other tried to bring them into subjection; and were as much Polish as Russian, until the intolerance of the Jesuits threw them finally into the arms of the power that professed their own religion. The communities of the Don were formed of Russians, Tartars, and Circassians, under similar circumstances. The name, "Cossack," originated here from the Turkish word *casak*, "partisan," "light-horseman." The borderers of the Ukraine were first called *Zaporogues*; a term which indicated their abode "above the cataracts" of the Dnieper. Completely tamed by the severity of Peter and Catherine, they are now military colonists, with many privileges, and great equality amongst each other. The lands they cultivate do not belong to the individual proprietors, but to the commune.

At Voltaire's death Catherine bought his library, and had it arranged, with his bust in the middle, in a sumptuous apartment of the palace. With a spurious liberalism, quite in Voltaire's taste, she pretended to copy institutions, the spirit of which she could not adopt. Thus she once determined to have a Parliament, and convoked Deputies from all the provinces to Moscow, to compile a "fundamental legislation." It soon came out, however, that there were still to be ukases; and no reply could be given to the homely remark of a Tartar, that if there were still to be ukases, he did not see the use of laws! Another time the Empress published an ukase, ordering the word "slave" to be banished from the Russian vocabulary: however, the *thing* remained unchanged, and, worse, its action was extended; for it was in the reign of this Princess that the peasants of Little Russia were reduced to the condition of serfs, which they had hitherto escaped.

At the close of the eighteenth century Russia had made immense progress towards the accomplishment of Peter the Great's projects. She had acquired supremacy in the Baltic, and nearly exclusive possession of the Black Sea and the Caspian. She had begun to domineer in Persia, with a view to open the road to India. She knew how to convert her neighbours into dependents, by tempting them with territory; or, when their hostility was aroused by her usurpations, she managed to conquer their resistance by the influence she possessed over Cabinets at a distance. She presented a spectacle of territorial aggrandizement such as the world had not witnessed since ancient Rome; and it was not obtained, like that of Rome, by fierce conflict with her equals; for she had never come into hostile contact, as a principal, and unaided, with any of the great powers of Europe: she had but profited by the weakness, or the disorganization, or the decay, of neighbouring countries.

The reader is aware that the unfortunate Emperor Paul was murdered in March, 1801, in his new palace of St. Michael, in



the most determined and barbarous manner, by some Nobles who had suffered private injuries, and persuaded themselves that they were doing good service to their country. Early on the following morning Alexander was proclaimed Emperor of all the Russias. "May the horror of this first day," he exclaimed, "be effaced by the glory of those that are to follow!" Alexander had the natural religious instinct of the people he was called to govern; and the theocratic principles which previous Sovereigns had professed in deference to the spirit of their people, became matter of real conviction with him. The administrative bureaucracy, borrowed from Germany, was, indeed, retained as a convenient instrument; but the Asiatic idea of the supreme power, formed under the influence of the Mongols, and the peculiarly Russian idea of the religious character and mission of this supreme power, were dominant; and the sympathies of the Court became intensely national. Boris Godunof and Peter the Great had so far understood the Russian character, that they knew how to use popular superstitions and prejudices to serve their own ambitious purposes; but Alexander, and Nicolas after him, who adopted the popular conceptions and aspirations for their own sakes, felt themselves responsible to God and to Russia, and made their personal ambition the instrument of the ambition of their people. In this important respect the reigns of Alexander and Nicolas have formed a new period in Russian history. The national spirit has developed itself among the higher classes, partly through the example of the Princes, partly through the enthusiasm awakened by the great struggle with Napoleon, and still more, perhaps, from a participation in the general tendencies of the age, which create, in all countries, a feeling of nationality previously unknown. The Russian language is now spoken at Court, by order of Nicolas. Russian literature no longer consists in translations and imitations; it has begun to be original. Karamsin wrote his Classical History of Russia early in this century. Mouravieff, tutor of the Grand Dukes Alexander and Constantine, has written a History of the Russian Church. Kriloff displayed his genius for fables and apologues so far back as 1808, writing in that satirical spirit in which his countrymen excel, and depicting Russian manners, ideas, prejudices, character, physiognomy, and even costumes, with wonderful fidelity. Gogol and Kukolnik are distinguished dramatists. Iukovski, Batiuchkov, Lermontoff, are poets, —eclipsed, however, by Alexander Pouchkin, whose death, in a duel in 1837, was bewailed as a national misfortune. There are also respectable labours in oriental languages, undertaken in connexion with the University of Kazan.

During the first years of his reign Alexander managed to reconcile a somewhat dissipated life with his constitutional mysticism; but he had struggles of conscience; and when Madame

de Krudener forced her way into his tent one evening, as he passed through Germany on his march to Paris, he received her as a messenger from Heaven, and learned to read his Bible with prayer, and to ask a blessing from God upon all his undertakings. It was in the first fervour of his conversion that he proposed the Holy Alliance, in which the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia concurred, through a sort of condescendence to the whim of their royal brother, and with the feeling, doubtless, that it might usefully counteract the prevailing democratic spirit; but, for the ardent, and at that time generous, mind of the Czar, it was really the expression of his heart's desire to wield his sceptre according to the will of God, and for the good of the millions confided to him. We knew the late Monsieur Empeytaz, of Geneva, who was intimately acquainted with Alexander at that eventful period, was one of his spiritual advisers, and often bowed the knee with him in private prayer; and he was persuaded of the entire sincerity with which the young Monarch composed the manifesto of the Alliance. If we remember rightly, the Rev. Legh Richmond, also, and some pious members of the Society of Friends, had opportunities of edifying conversation or prayer with Alexander during his visit to England.

Even in the time of Catherine II., a Monsieur St. Martin, a Frenchman, had brought a sort of religious mysticism into vogue among the upper classes of Russia. It escaped conflict with the Greek Church by hiding itself under the cloak of Freemasonry: the terrible Souvaroff and Prince Potemkin were among its adepts; and it made Alexander's religious ideas more comprehensible to some of those about him than they otherwise would have been. He cherished fond ideas of religious and civil reformation. The Bible was to become a household book in Russia. The Bible Society of St. Petersburg was instituted under his immediate protection; and its branches soon spread into the remotest regions of Siberia. He abolished the Secret State Chancery and sundry cruel punishments, permitted the nobility to emancipate their serfs if they pleased, and improved the condition of the serfs of the Crown,—both of them measures intended to pave the way for a future general emancipation. He proved the sincerity of his liberalism on September 27th, 1815, by proclaiming Poland a distinct and constitutional kingdom; the laws and taxes to be voted by a National Assembly; the serfs to be enfranchised gradually; the Judges immovable; the Diet to consist of sixty-four Senators nominated by the King for life, seventy-seven appointed by the Nobles, and fifty-one Deputies of Communal Assemblies; the Polish army not to be employed out of Europe. When the Herald-at-Arms of Poland proclaimed the kingdom at Warsaw, there was immense enthusiasm; the Palatines appeared at the coronation with their several banners; the eagle of the Sobieski floated every where; and

the shouts of a re-nationalized people rent the air. Alas that it should have been but a delusion and a dream!

When Madame de Staël visited Russia, "You will be hurt, Madam," said the Emperor, "on witnessing the serfdom of the peasantry. I have done what I could; I have enfranchised the serfs of my own dominions; but I must respect the rights of the Nobles just as much as if we had a constitution, which, unfortunately, we have not." "Sire, your character is a constitution," said the talented authoress,—of course, with winning smile and graceful inclination. Unfortunately for Russia, and for the world, this clever piece of flattery was nothing more, as the sequel proved. Alexander's generous purposes were the fruits of impulse rather than of fixed and clearly understood principle. He was naturally inconstant; and his religion, though heartfelt, had a character of vague mysticism, partly from personal temperament, partly because this is the form which religion invariably assumes when its external profession and rites have become so corrupt and materialized as not to bear examination. His liberalism was earnest enough to make him wish to be, under God, the minister of good to his subjects; but it did not carry him so far as to make him allow them to do good to themselves without his help. The autocratic habit of thinking remained unchanged beneath the superficial, though by no means affected, admiration of the state of happier societies; and he gave Poland a Constitution without understanding the practical working of self-government, without any serious intention of abdicating his absolute power, and without so much as perceiving that he ought in consistency to do so; just as he actually, at about the same time, proposed declaring his Ministers responsible, though a ukase would have force of law, whether countersigned by the Ministers or not! He had imbibed too deeply that Ultramontane theory of divine right, which pretends to recognise God's supremacy over human society more directly by looking upon men as belonging to their Prince, than by looking upon them as belonging to themselves. It soon appeared that the Poles and their Emperor had not the same idea of constitutional monarchy. When, in 1818, they petitioned for trial by jury, and the liberty of the press, as corollaries of the franchises they had already obtained, the Czar closed the Session abruptly. The Diet was not re-opened until 1822, and then publicity of discussion was suppressed: a change had come over Alexander's sympathies. Now that the din of battle was hushed in Europe, and its smoke cleared away, it was easier to perceive the extent to which the principles of the French Revolution had survived five-and-twenty years of strife, pervaded the minds of men, and changed the face of society. The Emperor shuddered at the advancing tide of democracy, and persuaded himself that Providence had put a million of bayonets at his disposal in order to

turn it back. Prince Metternich, who, though the Minister of another empire, had great weight with Alexander, did his best to foster those dispositions. The revolutionary attempts in Italy, the practical difficulty felt in governing Poland on the constitutional system, without becoming himself a constitutional Monarch, the spread of secret societies in Russia itself, all concurred to confirm the Czar in the idea that resistance to the spirit of modern times was his particular mission. Young men were no longer sent abroad to study at the expense of the Crown; the Professors of political sciences were deprived of their chairs; an inquisitorial temper was felt every where. Even the insurrection in Greece, which all the traditions of Russian policy should have induced the Emperor to sustain, could not tempt him from his determination to support existing powers under all circumstances. He acquiesced in the determination of the Congress of Verona, not to receive the envoy of the Greek insurgents; and, as we learn from Chateaubriand's "Memoirs," the French intervention of 1823, to put down constitutional government in Spain, was essentially his work.

So late as 1819, we find Alexander engaging in prayer with William Allen, and betraying considerable emotion at their parting. Under Metternich's influence, he meditated suppressing the Bible Society, which would have been a final rupture with all his earlier tendencies; but he did not actually take this step. In 1825, he undertook a journey to the south of his dominions, and was apparently about to come to some decision in favour of Greece, when he fell ill at Taganrog, and died after a few hours' suffering. It is believed by many that he was poisoned by some of the ultra-theocratic party, who felt they could not depend upon him; and, in corroboration of this idea, it is alleged, that, having taken the draught prepared by his Physician, he looked fixedly at the latter, and exclaimed, "O crime!" It is possible this story may not be true; imagination is wont to make great men die by extraordinary means; and so many Czars have met violent deaths, as to render suspicions likely to arise in their case, even when unfounded. Be that as it may, the Grand Duke Constantine, who should have succeeded his brother, renounced the throne, because he felt himself too unpopular among the Boyards to be sure of his life upon it. "Whether his abdication warded off the fate he dreaded, God knows," says M. de Custine; "and, perhaps, there are men too who know."

The death of Alexander, and the abdication of Constantine, placed Nicolas upon the throne for which nature made him; and the energy of his iron character found its first occasion to display itself, in his celebrated suppression of the revolt among the troops at St. Petersburg. It should be premised that the first secret societies of Russia, *The Union of Safety*, and *The True and Faithful Children of the Country*, formed in the war of 1815,

only sought to ameliorate existing institutions. *The Society of Knights*, formed later, and *The Union of Public Weal*, projected a republic, which, as they were all young Nobles, would have turned out to be an oligarchy. That of *The United Slavonians* would have organized, in one vast confederacy, all the Slavonians with the Roumans and Magyars; that is to say, the eastern half of Europe; and Petzel, one of their number, had a new code of laws ready to publish, as soon as there should be a people for whom to legislate. The death of Alexander took the conspirators by surprise; but it was an opportunity which they could not let go; so they broke out into insurrection at St. Petersburg, proclaiming Prince Trubetskoi Dictator. The troops had been disaffected by artful and busy insinuations that there had been foul play used to procure the abdication of their legitimate Prince, Constantine; and armed thousands filled the great square of Isaac, shouting, "Hurrah for the Constitution!" which the poor fellows, in their ignorance, had been taught to believe was the name of Constantine's wife. Singular spectacle! an attempt at revolution, got up by a few enthusiasts of republican, or at least liberal, ideas; and it could only be rendered formidable by misleading the royalist zeal of the soldiers! Such an attempt, for which the people whom it was proposed to liberate were utterly unprepared, and which they were incapable of understanding, could in no circumstances have been finally successful; but if the misunderstanding of the soldiers had continued, it might have led to the most awful anarchy. This was averted, as every body knows, by the Emperor's presence of mind. Riding up alone in front of the revolted regiments, he exclaimed, with uplifted hand, and voice loud enough to reach far distant ranks, "Ye have sinned; down on your knees!" The armed multitude, spell-bound by the authority of his mien and gesture, yielded to their native instinct of submission, and fell on their knees: the rebellion was over,—a few cannon-shots dispersed the handful of real conspirators; the gibbet and Siberia did the rest. The Bible Society was suppressed in the following year; but a Protestant Society, on a limited scale, was allowed to be formed in its stead.

Nicolas has nothing of Alexander's constitutional melancholy, nor does he seem to share his brother's aspirations after a real and personal piety. He is a man of strict and even stern morality, setting great value on the domestic affections and virtues, and has continued to keep the Russian Court ostensibly pure from the profligacy which once sullied it more than any Court in Europe; but his relaxations have a worldly character, and his religion consists apparently in worship of the authority he wields. He has become the very incarnation of the theocratic spirit of his people. When putting on the insignia of the Kingdom of Poland, he swore, indeed, to reign according



to the Charter; but he chafed continually under his promise, calling the constitutional system one of falsehood, and not perceiving that in his own case the falsehood consisted in the unwillingness of the man to carry out the system. The civil war and the re-conquest of Poland, in 1830-31, set him free from his obligation; while the second French Revolution, the changes that followed, and the hopes that were awakened throughout great part of Europe, armed him all the more against the democratic spirit of the age, and made him assume, in his own eyes, and those of the world, the attitude of the great champion of authority.

The Emperor has not given up the idea of preparing the gradual emancipation of the serfs. In 1831, the Nobles of Livonia, Esthonia, and Courland were empowered to commute the personal services of their dependents, and their three days of labour in the week, for a territorial rent; and the wealthier proprietors have generally availed themselves of the permission, while the smaller proprietors, who oversee their own farming operations, and get more out of the peasants by the three days' labour, continue to maintain the old system. Those provinces, it will be remembered, were conquered from Sweden; serfdom was both less deeply rooted and less oppressive there than in Russia Proper. The Emperor wished to make the same ameliorations universal. A celebrated ukase of 1842 ordered the proprietors to regulate by contract their relations with their peasants, so that their reciprocal duties and rights should be defined, and exaction and oppression become less easy; but this measure failed before the passive resistance of the Nobles.

With the single exception of this fatal sore of serfdom, all the other tendencies of the reigning Autocrat are to strengthen the hands of despotism. The Nobles are subjected to a system of restraint and *espionnage* greater than ever. Books and newspapers from abroad are rigorously examined before they are allowed to circulate; they are almost always mutilated, and frequently prohibited altogether. The native press is kept under the most inquisitorial inspection: thus the critical Review, called "The Telegraph," published for ten years by an eminent man of letters, Polevoi, was suppressed in 1835 by authority. Strangers are exposed to the most systematic and vexatious surveillance. Russia is at once anxious to govern Europe, and afraid to come in contact with it. In other countries, order is but a means for higher ends; in Russia, the maintenance of silence and mechanical submission is the end for which human governments are supposed to exist. All possible means of producing religious unity, and bringing the varied populations of the empire into the pale of the orthodox Church, are resorted to,—intrigue, violence, favouritism, and systematic pressure. The patriotic chord was touched with such success in Lithuania, that over two millions of so-called "United Greeks"—that is, Greeks who, while retain-

ing their peculiar rites and Liturgy, were in communion with Rome—have been won back to the National Church. The Roman Catholic Priests and Nuns who interposed an obstacle to Greek proselytism in Poland, have met with downright persecution. The Lutheran peasantry of the Baltic provinces were induced, in numbers, to declare themselves Greeks by promises never intended to be kept; and, once re-baptized, are not allowed to return to their old communion. The Jews are subjected to all manner of humiliations, and no one is allowed to circulate copies of the Hebrew Scriptures among them. No Russian subject of any religion or sect can transfer himself to another Church, unless it be the Greek. Protestant Missionaries cannot baptize Heathen or Mahometan converts; and the unhappy Greek who would become either Roman Catholic or Protestant, without the preliminary caution of voluntary exile, must reckon upon a cell in a convent or in a madhouse, or else upon Siberia. In a word, Nicolas does his utmost to repair the fault of Providence, in letting man escape on the day of the creation, free and intelligent, into the midst of the universe. He has put society under perpetual martial law; he has established the discipline of a camp, instead of the order of a state; and, more than all, one man stands between High Heaven and sixty-seven millions of human beings, telling them they are to worship no God but the one he chooses, and in no way but the way he chooses.

The Czar has recently adopted the title, "the Lord who fears God;" the heir-apparent is, officially, "the Most Orthodox Lord." "There are few ukases," says M. Léouzon, "in which the words '*Holy Russia*' do not repeatedly occur." *Orthodoxy, autocracy, nationality*,—that is to say, intolerance, despotism, and exclusiveness,—these are the three principles on which every thing in the empire is made to turn. No means are spared of inculcating upon the people the most servile and idolatrous veneration for the Sovereign. In the Catechism the names of God and the Emperor are printed in large letters, that of Jesus Christ in small. The Emperor and members of the royal family are mentioned in the public prayers more frequently than that Name which has been given among men that they might be saved thereby. In the Catechism printed at Wilna in 1832, and imposed on the Roman Catholic children, the child is made to say, as part of the development of the Fourth Commandment: "The authority of the Emperor emanates directly from God. We owe him worship, submission, service, principally love, thanksgiving, prayer; in a word, adoration and love. He must be adored by words, by signs, by acts, by conduct, and in the bottom of the heart. The authorities whom he appoints must be respected, because they emanate from him. Through the ineffable action of this authority, the Emperor is every where. The Autocrat is an emanation of God, his Vicar, and his Minister."

It is difficult to read such statements, and to know that they are taught to millions of children, without being somewhat of the mind of the Starowers. If the Czar be not Antichrist, his system is undoubtedly very antichristian; and it is exactly what the Dictator of a Red Republic would aspire to realize.

The Holy Synod, or Supreme Ecclesiastical Council, has had the control of all higher studies confided to it, with the express purpose of infusing the theocratic spirit. Two principles preside over the direction of public instruction in Russia: one is, that every body is not admissible into the Universities; the other, that the Universities have not the right to teach every thing. The chairs of Philosophy have lately been suppressed at St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kharkof, Kazan, Kiev, Dorpat, at the Pedagogic Institute of St. Petersburg, and the Richelieu Lyceum at Odessa. At the same time Professors of Theology have been appointed to the chairs of Logic and Experimental Psychology. In 1849, the Emperor limited to three hundred the number of students to be received into the Universities at their own expense, only making exception for the faculty of Medicine, and for the Protestant faculty of Theology at Dorpat; moreover, preference was to be given to young men destined for the civil service. In the twenty-seven military schools, there are about ten thousand pupils who have all originality and spontaneousness drilled out of them. The different establishments under the direction of the Minister of Public Instruction, including the great majority of the schools in the empire, exclusive of Poland, reckon about 188,000 pupils. The Museums and scientific collections of Russia can bear comparison with those of England and France; but the instruction given even at the Universities is superficial, while the poor are almost altogether neglected. The villages of the domains of the Crown have a population of about 20,000,000 of serfs: now the official list of boys in the royal schools on those domains is 14,064, girls 4,643, total 18,707; or something about 1 in 1,100 persons! Reckoning the children of an age to go to school at one-sixth of the population, we may calculate that of the royal serfs 1 boy in 100 learns to read, and 1 girl in 400. It is probable that, if we knew all, it would be found that even this *minimum* consists of the children of Priests or Overseers. The serfs of the other proprietors are not better off in this respect than those of the Crown. Some years ago there were a few schools opened among them; but, for the most part, they have since been closed. Incurable Poland has, of course, its full share of restriction and suspicion in what concerns the schoolmaster. No Pole can have a foreigner as private tutor for his children, unless he consent to wear the livery of a servant: it is thought that preceptors who do not respect their profession, are least likely to be dangerous. The University of Wilna was abolished in 1832. The three upper classes in the Gymnasium

at Warsaw are limited to fifty pupils each; and these must belong to families living in the city or its neighbourhood. Yet with all this jealousy, Poland has a decided intellectual pre-eminence over Russia; and its modern literature is more rich than that of any age during its independence, as if its oppressed nationality had taken refuge in the Temple of the Muses as a last asylum. Mickiewicz is Poland's great living poet; Slovacki is a distinguished dramatist; and the unknown author of "the Infernal Comedy" is pronounced by the *Revue des Deux Mondes* worthy to rank among the most powerful writers of any age or country.

While the last fifty years have formed a new period in Russian history, by the reign of a national and seriously theocratic spirit in the Court, the more vulgar and old Russian process of extending the empire by conquest has been pursued without intermission. In vain do geography and diplomacy assign to her limits; she never concludes a treaty without aggrandizement; she undermines every thing within her reach; and the obscurity that surrounds her movements, renders them the more menacing. Never did any school of diplomacy display more address in taking advantage of circumstances, and in getting other powers to work for them, even those whose interests were most opposed to theirs. 1806-7 saw the singular spectacle of an English army in Egypt, and an English fleet in the Dardanelles, co-operating with the Russians on the Danube. This suicidal policy was interrupted, not by the returning wisdom of British Rulers, but by Alexander's changing his allies, or rather, his instruments. At the Conference of Tilsit, Alexander and Napoleon discussed the terms on which the world could be divided between them. They could not agree, because Alexander insisted on having both shores of the Dardanelles. "I offer you the half of Europe; I will help you to obtain it, secure you in the possession of it; and all I ask in return is the possession of a single strait, which is also the key of my house." Napoleon was too clear-sighted to be won by this appeal. It was only agreed that Russia should exclude the British flag from her ports, while France was to acquiesce in the conquest of Finland. Alexander thus finding his hands free, Sweden was summoned to abandon the English alliance; and on her refusal, a Russian army seized Finland, "to procure," says the Proclamation of General Buxhowden, "a sufficient guarantee, (!) in case his Swedish Majesty should persevere in the resolution not to accept the equitable conditions of peace that have been proposed to him." Then followed the only war that ever took place between England and Russia, and which was practically limited to a cessation of commercial intercourse. Our ally lost Finland for remaining faithful to us, and the Swedes consider Norway no compensation for the loss. The Congress of Vienna, in decreeing this compensation, only attempted to repair an injury upon Sweden by inflicting an injury upon

Denmark. In both cases it taught the nations loyalty, by dissolving unions consecrated by time, by benefits, and by affections. But it was necessary; for when France was divested of her conquests, and England restored foreign colonies in both hemispheres, Russia would restore nothing.

The Treaty of Tilsit stipulated the instant evacuation of Moldavia and Wallachia. In 1808, the Russian forces entered them again, and gained repeated victories over the Turks; and though the preparations of Napoleon's mighty invasion obliged Russia to conclude the Peace of Bucharest, 1812, which enabled her to concentrate her forces in the north, she did not the less by this treaty advance her frontier to the south. In the further east, more remote from European scrutiny, Russian ambition assumed fewest disguises. Georgia and the neighbouring provinces, after enjoying seventeen years' protection, had been annexed by a ukase of the Czar Paul in 1800. Then followed unprovoked aggressions upon Persia, and the Peace of Goolistan, (1814,) effected at an enormous sacrifice to the latter; and during its negotiation Russia would not hear of a formal mediation of England. A new war broke out on the accession of Nicolas, because the Persians were driven to despair by the harsh and unjust conduct of the Governor-General of Georgia. It was terminated by the Peace of Turkmanchai, (February, 1828,) in which, of course, Russia made new acquisitions, more important from the facility they afford for future aggressions, than from their real value. Her position on the Araxes is seven hundred miles beyond the frontier line traced by Peter the Great between the Volga and the Don; and the regiments stationed at her furthest outposts are at about equal distance from St. Petersburg and from Delhi. No sooner were the Persians off the Czar's hands, than he undertook that war against the Porte which led to the Treaty of Adrianople; and though, in deference to the expostulations of Europe, he disclaimed all intention to add to his dominions, yet he prevailed upon himself to accept the convenience of a considerable extent of coast on the Black Sea, and part of the Pachalic of Akhaltzik, with the possession of the mouth of the Danube, and sanitary regulations which virtually separate the Principalities of the Danube from Turkey. Erivan is now an arsenal for future operations against Persia, while Alexandropol threatens Turkey in Asia,—a citadel from which some future Romanof, is to set out on a career of Asiatic conquest. Four years later, the revolt of the Pacha of Egypt enabled the ever-vigilant Cabinet of St. Petersburg to obtain a new vantage-ground, which would have been cheaply purchased at the cost of another war. England and France had so reduced their naval forces, as to be unable to meet the Sultan's suit for protection against his rebellious vassal. The Czar seized the opportunity, and sent the Sultan a fleet and army; but extorted, as the price of his assistance, the Treaty of



Unkiar Skellessi, (1833,) whereby an alliance, offensive and defensive, was formed between the two powers; and the Porte engaged to close the Dardanelles against foreign ships of war. This treaty practically constituted Russia protectress of Turkey and mistress of the Dardanelles. "Russia knew well," says Sir John M'Neil, "that the most important point in a process of conquest, to a power which has to dread opposition, is that at which resistance ceases, and protection begins,—a point beyond which violence is no longer necessary, and the absence of collision presents no occasion for third parties to interpose."

Thus situated, Russia seemed to have adopted an expectant position, eschewing, for the moment, further territorial conquest, and reckoning upon the sure operation of time, for Turkey's internal decomposition. She presents herself, meanwhile, to the Rayah populations of the Turkish Empire, as the only depositary of the Christian faith; accustoming them to look to her in the most trifling matters; influencing the choice of their religious dignitaries, from the Metropolitan to the Parish Priest; using their ecclesiastical revenues as a fund to pension her creatures; printing for their public and private use Prayer Books, in which the Czar is prayed for as their natural protector and future Sovereign; and making her Consuls in every province the dispensers of rewards to her partizans, and the ministers of indirect vengeance upon the refractory. The troubles of 1848 drew the Czar from this quiescent attitude; his armed intervention in Hungary placed Austria under obligations that shackled her political independence. A foolish revolutionary excitement at Bucharest gave him an excuse for sending fifty thousand men into the Principalities. The occupation lasted three years:—men were surprised that it was not prolonged; but the joint occupation by ten thousand Turks paralysed its effects; it was thought better to withdraw, in order to return alone. Meantime, the occupation made Russia the creditor, as well as the protector, of these unfortunate populations. The Divan would not make the Wallachians pay any thing for the maintenance of its troops; but Russia, besides exacting an additional fifth over the ordinary revenue during the stay of her troops, set down the Hospodars £500,000 in her debt, and would not allow them to consult the Porte on the matter. Unhappy provinces! During the last eighty-five years they have been occupied by Russia eight times, and that, altogether, for more than thirty years; they have been the battle-field of the Russian and the Turk in twenty campaigns; and when their august protector does not send his legions to eat their corn, he lets the mouths of the Danube choke up, to prevent their exporting it, and underselling Odessa.

We need not report the different phases of the mingled process of menace, usurpation, and negotiation, which, beginning with the embassy of Prince Menschikoff, and ending with the

disaster of Sinope, has at length brought Russia into a positive conflict with the Western Powers, alike unexpected and unwelcome to her and to them. Evidently, the Emperor and his advisers counted upon the forbearance of Europe. His haughty mediation during the misunderstanding between Austria and Prussia was a sort of trial of the patience of Germany; and it satisfied the Autocrat, that he could go very far indeed, without awakening the opposition of the Conservative Governments of the Continent, who looked upon him as the great representative of the anti-revolutionary principle. France needed peace for her internal security; England was proverbially indisposed to war. Moreover, the peculiar policy of Russia had been so long pursued with success and impunity, that the Czar assumed a sort of prescriptive right to carry it out; he had accustomed himself to treat as unreasonable and presumptuous the resistance of other powers to his plans, and to see them end by giving him their co-operation and sanction. It is possible, that Austria was, to a certain extent, his accomplice; and that the mission of Count Leiningen was intended to give a colour to that of Prince Menschikoff. His confidential communications with the British Ministry, in the beginning of 1853, showed him, indeed, that they would be no partners to a partition of Turkey before the fact; but then there was nothing in their tone to lead him to suppose that they would proceed to extremities after it; and so he determined to dare that hostile occupation of the Principalities, which, after all he said to Sir Hamilton Seymour about the moribund state of Turkey, he must have looked upon as giving the signal for its dissolution, preparing for wholesale annexation, if possible,—if not, for the establishment of a power which should prove a dependency of Russia.

The fifteen-year wars of Napoleon I.—that most awful expenditure of human labour, human suffering, and human life, that the world ever witnessed—were, for all essential purposes, sterile of results. After so many millions had perished miserably,—multitudes in the field, and far greater multitudes from the consequences of war,—the nations found themselves in nearly the same situation in which they had been at the beginning; and the moral changes were yet less important than the material. In this respect, the wars of the French Empire are a pendant to the eighteenth century, rather than the proper beginning of the nineteenth. They belong, by principle, to a period in which mankind—the Continent, at least—disturbed itself for petty purposes, for selfish and personal motives, unlike those of the great quarrels of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The first attack of the Allied Sovereigns on the French Republic was, indeed, a war of principle; but it soon lost that character, and it effected nothing. On the contrary, the struggle which is now being begun between Russia, England, and France,

may be one pregnant with vast consequences for the future. As Mr. Urquhart says, "Wars in the West lead to great effusion of blood, but to little alteration of frontiers; those in the East alone determine great results." The three most powerful nations in the world are armed against each other; and those three nations are at the same time the proper representatives of the most fundamental differences:—they represent respectively the three great races which inhabit Europe, and the three great religions into which Christendom is divided. The belligerent parties are, on the one hand, the nations who are at the head and front of European civilization, the legitimate heirs of every thing that the West of Europe has acquired or accomplished through the experiences of fourteen centuries; on the other hand, the first military power in the world,—heart and body of an immense religious and national unity, with different remembrances and a different civilization, the latter aspiring to predominance. When the actors in this momentous crisis are such as these, Providence has some mighty act to accomplish. Let us draw near to witness it. But, first, what are the grounds on which Russia may hope for success, or claim help from Heaven, in the perilous contest which she has provoked?

What is the character of that Church which so proudly professes itself intended to regenerate the world? Like all the other corruptions of Christianity, it brings the worshippers into contact with magical rites, and living or dead mediators, instead of Jesus Christ. The religion it teaches is but a spiritual gymnasticism of genuflections, and orthodox signs of the cross. It has a copy of the Scriptures, richly bound, upon every altar; but it is *shut* with a golden clasp. The poor do not know how to read, and the Priests do not know its contents. Preaching is much rarer than in the Church of Rome; its worship of Mary is, at least, equally great, and its worship of departed saints in general: but there is this advantage in Russia,—that people cannot mistake the object of worship; for the ground refuses to retain the body of a real saint, and it comes to the surface incorrupt, after a certain time. It is thus that saints are distinguished from sinners; and this natural canonization is certainly more satisfactory than the legal process pursued at Rome. Ornamented pictures, in the Byzantine style, are the idols of the sanctuary; and every family has its *kiroth*, or little press, fastened in the wall, containing its holy images, before which a lamp is kept burning. Pilgrimages are in great esteem; and, of course, the most important is that to Jerusalem. The Greeks have certainly a better right to the key of the church at Bethlehem than the Latins; for there are annually twelve thousand pilgrims of the former communion, and but one hundred of the latter. The pilgrim, or "man of God," fasts prodigiously; but the more he can drink without becoming intoxicated, the more per-

sued the peasantry are of his holiness, and the more they value his blessing. This last feature is but one among innumerable symptoms of the separation between religion and morality in the thoughts of the people. The fasts are more frequent and more rigorous than in the Church of Rome; and, for that reason, the Carnival is twice as long. It lasts a fortnight, and is celebrated with disgraceful orgies. In addition to the elements of evil it presents in common with other degraded Churches, the peculiar characteristic of the Russian Church is, its absolute subserviency to the State. The Emperor is represented in the Holy Synod by a *haut Procureur*, who controls all its decisions. This functionary—the working head of the Church—is at this moment the cavalry General, Protasoff. The Russian Clergy have never reprobated any one bad act of the Government; the Council of Moscow, in 1595, confirmed the state of slavery instituted by Boris Godunof the year before; and the seal of the Church has never been wanting on any subsequent increase of rigour. It helps the police to deceive the people, and ever gratefully remembers that its cradle was the palace. The Government in turn exempts the persons of the Clergy from the knout and the cane. Catherine II. seized the property of the Church, and allotted, to both regular and secular Clergy, incomes to which the most intrepid ecclesiastical reformers can hardly object:—the Metropolitan receives £160 a-year; an Archbishop, £120! a Monk is “passing rich” on £6. 8s. Hence the Russian Priest tries to make money by all possible means, and to enjoy his neighbours’ tables as often as he can: he is not respected; his ignorance and gluttony are the themes of popular witticism. The Russian views his Priest with superstitious reverence while ministering at the altar; but if he meet him on the road when beginning a journey, it is a sign of bad luck, and he spits on the ground to avert the sinister omen. A painful proof that this contempt of the Clergy is not without foundation, is the number of them who appear before the criminal courts. In 1836, 208 Ecclesiastics were degraded for great crimes, and 1,985 were punished for offences more or less serious. Now, as in 1836 the total number of the Clergy was 102,426, it follows that one in fifty had been found guilty of immoral acts, sufficiently tangible to call down the action of the laws. In the following years the proportion increased. In 1839, it was *one in twenty*,—over 5,000 clerical criminals for the year. Of course there is no kind of Christianity so low as not to exhibit some traces of religious life; and we have heard that the reports of some of the Russian Missionaries to the Heathen in Siberia are such as to invite the sympathies of all Christians: but the fact is, that real piety in Russia seems a personal thing, and generally independent of ecclesiastical institutions. That revival of interest in religious matters which is felt all over the world, has also assumed in

Russia, among other shapes, that of *Messianism*, which is a democratic and social theory, with a dreamy religiousness about it. The Russian Nobles move from scepticism in the direction of a sort of Mysticism, which is at once a reaction against the mechanism of Russian institutions, civil and religious, and against the abstract Rationalism of the West. It deals in intuition rather than reflection, adores the name of Jesus Christ, and bitterly criticizes the official Church. It finds its expression most readily in Slavists out of Russia; and they are greater friends to Popery than to the Greek Church. It should be added, to complete this picture, that the Clergy have contributed nothing, as far as we can ascertain, to the higher literature of their country.

What is the social state of the nation that pretends it has elements of stability to communicate to Europe? According to the statistics of Tegoborski, Russia in Europe contained, in 1849, 62,047,000 inhabitants; Russia in Asia, 5,200,000. Of these 67,000,000, about 44,000,000 are pure Russian, forming the body and centre of this vast empire, which has surrounded itself with a mighty border of subjugated populations. By a strange anomaly, which has nothing resembling it in history, it is this central properly Russian people which is alone cursed with serfdom. "None but a real Russian can be a slave in Russia," writes Tourgueneff with bitterness. The institution has never been introduced in some of the conquered countries; it is disappearing in the others; but it weighs, with all its force, upon those alone who might reasonably be expected to be masters. There are proprietors of English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Tartar, Armenian, and Jewish origin, and they all have native Russians for their serfs; and the Tartar origin of the institution is unequivocally revealed in the very word for serf, *Chrestianin*, evidently a variation of *Christianin*, "Christian!" It was the term by which the Tartar designated the entire people. The service due to the proprietor by his peasant is called *obrok*. It consists either in three days' work during the week, or in money; the average of the latter being about three pounds sterling in the year. They are generally mildly treated; but their master may, if he pleases, beat them cruelly for the most trifling fault; he is not even legally responsible if they die of ill-treatment received at his hands, or by his orders, unless they die within three days after being beaten; and as for venturing to complain to the authorities of any ill-usage, here is the letter of the law: "If a serf, failing in the obedience which he owes his lord, presents a denunciation against him, still more if he address this denunciation to his Majesty the Emperor, he will be given up, along with the writer who drew up his petition, to the justice of the tribunals, and treated according to the utmost rigour of the law." Practically, the lord does as he pleases with his peasants; separates families, transfers them from one property to another,



is master of the labour of the men and the honour of the women; and, when he lives in a large town, he sends culprits to the prison, with an order for so many lashes, as is done with the slaves in America. It is easy to conceive how the character is degraded under this system. The peasants have proverbial sayings which speak volumes: "God is too high, the Czar is too far off;" "A man beaten is worth two with a whole skin;" "They are lazy fellows who don't beat us," &c. The Athenian slave of old could require to be sold to another master; but the serf who has the misfortune to fall into bad hands has no such resource. Hence he sometimes breaks out, and does himself justice,—wild and terrible justice. There were awful outrages perpetrated by insurgent serfs, on some large estates, in 1839. Perhaps Russia will have one day to struggle with a revolution on Communist principles: its present discipline is a sort of apprenticeship, the empire being one vast Phalanstery. The Cossacks have some Communist institutions; there is a small fanatical sect, called the Douchoborzi, who are decided Communists; and, more than all, the serf can never be persuaded that the land does not belong to *him*. When property changes hands, the serf imagines that it is he himself who is sold, in the first instance, and that the land only goes along with him. The serf is by law incapable of holding immovable property; and no one can give him credit for a higher amount than five assignat roubles, that is, about four shillings; so that if he has occasion to borrow a greater sum, he must ask his master to do it for him. Even when a serf obtains permission from his master to go and exercise some trade in a town, paying, of course, his *obrok* in money, the Government licence for the trade is taken out by the master, and the latter would have a legal right to appropriate the earnings of the serf. This, indeed, is never done, except in one or two infamous instances; but if the lord be ruined, which often happens, there is nothing to protect the property of his serfs from his creditors. Serfs have been often known to furnish needy but kind Nobles with money to buy themselves; others possess lands and houses in the name of their masters. A few of those engaged in commercial pursuits have large fortunes; but they are at their master's mercy; and when he gives some great ball at his hotel at St. Petersburg, the merchant must leave his business, don his master's livery, and wait at his table.

In 1850 there were in all the Russias (the Crimea included, we suppose) 11,900,840 male serfs belonging to Nobles; and of these latter there were 20,456 who possessed each of them above a hundred serfs. The population, then, under the worst kind of servitude amounts to about twenty-four millions. The male serfs of the Crown are over nine millions; they are called "free peasants" in official language. Their *obrok*, when not increased by the tyranny of subordinates, is only fifty shillings,

and they can easily procure permission to change their residence. They have, however, to work at roads, to lodge soldiers, and transport their baggage; and they escape the service of the Boyards to fall into the frequently ruder hands of the officers of Government. The really free peasants are about a million and a half. They are divided into two classes, distinguished by the greater or less liberty allowed them of possessing houses of their own, or a few acres of ground. Thus the real Russian people, the freemen, are fewer in number than the inhabitants of Switzerland or Holland; for the three millions of population represented by the last-mentioned class are, many or most of them, Tartars and other strangers, not native Russians. The small number of persons engaged in mercantile pursuits, their little wealth, comparatively, and the low estimation in which they are held, are so many more symptoms of the social state of Russia. Will it be believed that in the whole empire there are only 900 merchants and traders, &c., of the first guild (capital £8,000), 1,900 of the second (capital £3,200), 34,000 of the third (capital £1,280), and 5,300 serfs trading with authorization of their masters? It should be noted that slavery is much milder in Turkey than serfdom in Russia, and it is daily getting rarer: the slave-market at Constantinople has been closed since 1846.

When a people is held in the grasp of an unlimited and relentless despotism, so that no man can be sure of himself, or of any thing he possesses, the ordinary instinct of acquisition transforms itself into one of unbridled cupidity. This is, doubtless, the chief reason of the venality which disgraces the bureaucracy of Russia in all its ranks, and against which the inexorable severity of the Emperor Nicolas has proved itself powerless. Alexander used to say that if his *employés* could steal his teeth during his sleep without awakening him, they would not scruple doing it. A lawsuit is not a matter of right for the Judges who are to determine it, but one of speculation. The subordinate bureaucratic aristocracy are often directly revolutionists by their own ideas, and become so indirectly by the hatred their tyranny excites in others. For the same reason gaming is universal: it is, next to drunkenness, the dominant passion of the lower order; and, among the higher, he who does not like play is suspected of being a conspirator. We have already alluded to the excesses in which the young Nobles so frequently indulge; and that the morals of the people are no better, appears from the single fact, that the Foundling Hospitals of St. Petersburg and Moscow receive annually 12,000 children,—that is, more than the legitimate births of those capitals.

What is the nature of that power that claims to be, in a peculiar sense, divine? The House of Holstein Gottorp cannot pretend to represent the principle of legitimacy: its claims flow from an *illegitimate* daughter of Peter the Great, and it came

upon the throne by a revolution, so late as 1762. It is not connected with a long series of national remembrances, like that of Rurik or the Bourbons. It is not the symbol of great and beneficial changes, the guardian of a nation's dearly-bought liberties, like the House of Hanover in England. Nor is its origin lost in the night of time, and clothed with a sort of superhuman character, like that of the Merovingians and the Ottomans. The principle of Russian loyalty is the divinization of the powers that *be*, under the influence of physical force and spiritual terrorism, and without questioning how these powers came to *be*. The Government is obliged to exercise upon the people a *prestige* stronger than the feeling of their own rights. The Russians would be highly scandalized if the Czar took himself for a mere Emperor: there is a mysterious spell, a "dim religious light," about the very title, borrowed from the extinct royalty of Constantinople. He cannot treat other people or Princes as equals; every war he undertakes is a holy war; he must act as a demigod, or cease to be absolute. Every Czar must make gigantic efforts to accomplish the ideal: it was never more lofty than at the present moment, and never more worthily sustained. The Emperor Nicolas is, perhaps, the finest man in his dominions physically, and the most energetic morally. He is at work in his cabinet in the morning, while the whole empire is still buried in slumber: his vigilant and intelligent attention to every thing makes him a kind of special providence over his people. A natural inconvenience of having assumed such an attitude is, that the Emperor is responsible for every thing. Incredible as it may appear, when any catastrophe happens, even those which no human foresight could have avoided, the police hush up the matter, and make it appear less dreadful than the reality, lest the people should blaspheme the idol. A railway accident, or lives lost in a storm in the Gulf of Finland, are dangerous to the royal popularity; and newspapers are ordered to be silent about offences and crimes, even when they have nothing to do with politics. Another inconvenience of power founded on superstition is, that it is limited in its exercise by the very prejudices through which it subsists. The Czar can, at his will, tear hundreds of thousands from their homes and families, says M. de Maistre, but he dare not correct the Calendar,—that impiety were as much as his life and crown were worth. It tasked Peter the Great's despotism to its full extent to get his recruits' beards cut off, which made Napoleon say that if there ever came a Czar who would let his beard grow, he would give law to Europe. But the essential objection to Czarism is, that it would retain mankind in an inferior and degraded condition, opposed to the purpose of God in creating man in his image. Men were not intended to be the property of society,—the idea of the old Pagans and modern Socialists; nor to be the property of

an Emperor,—the idea of the despots of old Rome and modern Russia: they were intended to belong to themselves and to God. There are states of society in which men conceive themselves as existing only to be the limbs of others, as was the case of the Scottish clansman towards his Chief only a hundred years ago: the allegiance, affection, and fidelity, which belong to God, are transferred to a creature; and the man himself is lowered, because the being whom he serves is a mortal, and a fallen one. As long as this state of subserviency is submitted to willingly, without questioning, as a thing that could not be otherwise, it may elicit acts of admirable devotedness; and when an entire people is in this state, they may be capable of exhibiting resistless energy: but it is not the less an imperfect condition, which must come to an end sooner or later, and which becomes intolerable and intensely degrading, when felt to be a yoke, and submitted to unwillingly. Now, the degree of *espionnage* and severity which the Government of the Autocrat uses, even in Russia Proper, would seem to indicate that the people are already tired of paternal government. It is true there is much to awaken respect and enthusiasm in the personal character of the Czar; and the Russians of all ranks sometimes appear intoxicated with slavery, glorying in the power of the Autocrat's will, as if it represented, in some sort, their own. But if this feeling be universal and steady, why so much violence and suspicion? There was a democratic conspiracy suppressed in 1849, and we live in an age in which fictions cannot long survive. In any case, there are millions, from the Finlander to the Georgian, subjected to the Russian sceptre, who have no sympathy with Czarism. So intolerable is the Muscovite yoke above all others, that tribes of Circassians, who were Christians, became Mahometans in the hope of securing more effectual support from Turkey; and, in 1771, half a million of Kalmuks fled across Asia, fighting their way through hostile tribes, in order to escape from the Russian to the Chinese territory. The continuance of the sullen passive resistance of unhappy Poland is proved by the measures taken to crush it. A ukase of May, 1852, regrets that the Polish Nobles systematically abstain from seeking civil or military service; it ordains that the sons of all the Nobles who are not of the Greek religion, and who possess a fortune of a hundred serfs, are to be enrolled at the age of eighteen, with the rank of Ensigns, if they can pass the necessary examination. They can only escape by accepting the civil service. It seems the Poles regret even the suppression of the Custom-Houses between Russia and Poland, because, though a financial boon, it tends to efface their nationality more and more.

Are the aggressions of Russia the result of a national providential calling to assimilate to herself populations kindred by blood and by religion? This is a question upon which, unlike

the preceding ones, something can be said for Russia. All great nations have gradually drawn around one centre provinces and minor kingdoms that were once politically distinct from the people forming the nucleus, but related to it geographically or ethnologically, or in both ways together. Thus the separate kingdoms of the Saxon Heptarchy merged into one; and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland have been successively added to that one. Thus France and Spain have each come to be one undivided monarchy, absorbing separate and often hostile provinces, some of which maintained their political independence for ages. The process has not been repeated in Germany for want of a nucleus; yet even there the smaller feudal principalities do gradually melt into the larger. Now, it is clear, that, if those populations of Turkey in Europe which have a Slavonic origin and Greek religion are being attracted towards Russia by the operation of the same law which has made France and Spain undivided nations, then no power on earth can prevent that result. However, we are very much mistaken, or this attraction is much more feeble. Every authentic information that reaches us about the state of the Christians in the Ottoman Empire leads us to the conclusion, that Russia, by her despotism and selfishness, has forfeited her natural claims upon the kindred races of the South. The Greeks of Epirus would profit by the present emergency to throw off the Moslem yoke, but it is with the wish to belong to Independent Greece; the sluggish Bulgarian resists the temptation to insurrection; the hardy Servian would die to maintain his patriarchal democracy. The Rouman, whose tie to Russia is that of religion, not race, entertains toward his *protector* a constantly and justly increasing hatred. Those rich provinces may be the seat of a future Christian confederacy, mistress of the Dardanelles; but we hope and believe they never will be Russian. The extraordinary disclosures in Sir Hamilton Seymour's Dispatches have not only painfully undeceived those who trusted in the Emperor Nicolas's probity and magnanimity, but they have also betrayed an indifference to the welfare of the Eastern Christians, except as instruments to effect his purposes, such as we should have believed a calumny from any lips but his own. The determination so haughtily expressed not at any price to allow those countries to attain to independence and political importance, shows the vanity of the pretence of paternal feeling on the ground of either Slavism or orthodoxy. What Russia wants is the actual or virtual possession of the Sound and the Dardanelles, and her position with respect to both is thus ably summed up by Mr. Urquhart: "In two nations of the world political vitality is concentrated in the capital: those two capitals are exposed to bombardment from a fleet; both are placed on the inner side of narrow and defensible straits; both are exposed from within to a superior



Russian naval force; the maritime power of both has been destroyed by England; and Russia has constructed a powerful arsenal and fortress, which from an equal distance permanently menaces both,—Cronstadt for Copenhagen, Sevastopol for Constantinople." The temptation is strong. It is a singular configuration of the earth which has left this immense empire without ready access to the ocean, except through two internal seas, having such narrow outlets, without the possession of which she can be hermetically sealed up by a superior maritime power, and with the possession of which she would hold in her hand the food of nations, defy their attacks, and attack them at advantage when she pleased. With those two "keys of the house" Russia could, indeed, give laws to the world. It was only since the beginning of this century that the Germans left off praying in their parish churches for deliverance from the Turks. They would do well to substitute a nearer and more powerful enemy of their national independence.

What is the material strength with which the Colossus of the North means to meet the power of England and France? As to his fleets, though superior in number of guns and men, they will doubtless be swept from the seas, if they show themselves there. Ay, if skill and courage can do it, they will possibly, ere these pages meet the reader's eye, have been destroyed under the very batteries of Cronstadt and Sevastopol. As to his armies, though we may not have implicit faith in the million of bayonets and the eighteen hundred cannon officially trumpeted forth, and though the universally-practised embezzlement renders every corps weaker and worse-appointed than officials themselves can ascertain, yet those armies are certainly numerically superior to those of any power in the world. These are the troops of whom Frederick the Great used to say, "You can kill, but you cannot beat, them;" and Napoleon, "After you have killed them, you have still the trouble of knocking them down." The Russian soldier is, indeed, more apathetic than would be supposed from his worship of the Sovereign; it would seem, that superstition, carried beyond a certain point, is too materialized to produce active fanaticism. Like the Spaniard in similar circumstances, the Russian made his faith to consist in hating the infidels; and, like the Spaniard, the remembrance of early religious controversies is stamped indelibly on his mind: the one glories in the title of *Catholic*, and the other in that of *Orthodox*: but the native independence of the Spaniard hindered him from identifying his religion with obedience to his Prince, and his fanaticism was all the more energetic from not being diverted out of its proper channel. The Russian, on the contrary, marches to death with a sort of melancholy obedience. The very shout with which the army greets the Czar breathes this sort of disconsolate patriotism, "We are ready to do all we

can, your Imperial Majesty." Fanaticism is a fire that burns out sooner or later in the breast of every people, and it is only upon trial that it can be known whether it is extinct or not. The trouble taken to get up enthusiasm among the Russian soldiers and people at present, may be a proof that there is too little; and in that case wholesale desertion may break up and disorganize the legions that have crossed, or are to cross, the Pruth: as it is, no army in the world, except the Russian, presents the spectacle of officers of high rank in intelligence with the enemy, and the desertion of whole companies at a time. If, however, the spirit that gave the Russian soldiers of a former generation their extraordinary passive courage, still survives in the bosoms of those hundreds of thousands,—in that case no possession of the seas by their enemies, and no strategic disadvantages, can keep them from first successes in the field, which will startle those amongst us who treat the war with levity. If, —to make a third supposition,—if they do really wield their arms in the spirit of a holy war, we may be assured they will light their watch-fires before the gates of *Czargrad*, the "City of the Czars," as they significantly term Constantinople. Even in this extreme and unlikely case, they will finally serve—not their master's ambition, but—that cause of oppressed nationality, with which he has so little sympathy. However the war begins, it must, humanly speaking, end well; for England is almost the only market for the raw produce of Russia; the simple cessation of commerce must ruin the Russian finances, private and public; her armies, who live upon so little, may subsist for a season or two by the pillage of the wretched populations they profess to deliver; but, in the end, Russia must succumb, and the emancipation of the Rayahs will remain, at least, one durable result of the struggle,—an example and a pledge for other oppressed populations.

"Europe," says M. Thiers, "unwisely divided, like the towns of Greece in the presence of the Kings of Macedonia, will have probably the same fate." This startling comparison will have suggested itself to many minds; it occurred to us in childhood. In both cases there is a half-civilized country uniting the arts of its neighbours to its own barbarian hardihood,—a country geographically forming the base of the pyramid of which the nations whose liberties it was to absorb formed the apex,—its extent nearly equal to all the rest put together, its Government stronger, and pursuing its ambitious aims with untiring hereditary zeal, profiting by the traditional rivalry of its victims, until it had them all in its power. Again, it might be suggested, that military and territorial Rome beat naval and commercial Carthage; beat her, too, upon her own element, creating a navy artificially, as Russia has done. Or, without going so far for examples, Poland, with its three religions and its intestine dis-

sensions, was no bad epitome of Europe. But we are nothing daunted by these ill-omened analogies. We can see why Macedonia and Rome both triumphed in their turns,—they were both necessary for the purposes of Providence; but what has Russia to communicate to the world? We do not found our confidence on Britain's "dread arm of floating power," nor yet on that gallant army whose heroism makes up for the smallness of its numbers, nor yet upon the help of our powerful and chivalrous ally. The real ground of confidence for those who scan the destinies of England in the light of history and human progress, is this,—that God has a great work for England to do, and she may not be hindered in its performance; while our adversary would, in principle, bring back the world to the state that preceded the Middle Ages. Russia cannot even stand up before the West as the heiress of Greece disputing once more, after twenty centuries, the supremacy of Rome. No; England and France are better representatives of whatever elements ancient Greece possessed to bequeath to the future. The entire sum of the acquisitions of the old world turned the Alps at our extremity of Europe; they have been preserved and augmented amongst us; the experiences necessary for the future development of the human race have been made and are being made amongst us; while Russia is but the repetition of the despotism and the social corruption that were fatal to the Western and Eastern Empires in their turns. Doubtless the day will come when the greatest of the Slavonian nations will contribute largely to the common weal of humanity. We have all something to give and something to receive; and the natural piety, the reverential feeling, the respect for superiority, the wonderful imitative power, and the innate grace of the Russian may make him, in many respects, a model and a helper for his fellows: but it is not as the instruments of Czarism that our Slavonian brethren will ever attain that position.

We have spoken as if England were the real adversary of Russia, and France but a powerful ally. It is even so: the principles of antagonism which exist between England and Russia are so much deeper than those existing between France and Russia, that morally the struggle lies between the two former powers as principals.

In the first place, they are rivals, as the two nations possessing in themselves the greatest powers of expansion, the greatest resources for the future, just as they are also the least vulnerable at the present moment. If the world were to remain as it is for a century, without any great changes or commotions, the other nations of Europe would maintain the same position and relative strength that they have now; while Russia and England would both have become far stronger in proportion than they are now. The one would have filled her vast territories with a prodigious

population, and probably augmented her continental acquisitions; the other would have spread over the seas, peopled distant regions with millions of her children, and augmented her oceanic acquisitions, colonizing with the energy of the ancient Greeks, but on a vastly larger scale. It is remarkable that both the nations of the future should be enemies of the Pope; so that, in the natural course of events, even without any considerable proselytism, Popery must more and more lose its hold on the world. Hence the equally bitter hatred with which both Russia and England are regarded by reflecting men of the Ultramontane school, as, for instance, by the late Donoso Cortez. Some eighty years ago, Herder, in his "Philosophy of History," after criticizing the Chinese, breaks off with a—"But what is to be expected of a people who fill their stomachs with hot water?" He would have been surprised to learn that the empire of the world should be one day disputed by two tea-drinking nations. Our readers are aware that tea is a favourite beverage of even the poor in Russia. The humblest housewife's first purchase is a teapot, and a *samovare*, or kettle of yellow copper.

In the second place, there is the rivalry of material interests. We meet in China, in India, in Persia, in the Levant. The present Russian expedition against Khiva is the fourth; and, if successful, the conquest will soon be extended along the Oxus to the northern slopes of the Hindoo Koosh. The conquest of Herat and Kandahar by the Shah of Persia, had it been accomplished, would have been another Russian advance towards India, at least for the purpose of intrigue and disorganization. The latest Russian acquisitions south of the Caucasus bring her frontier within nine miles of the road from Trebizond to Tabriz,—the route by which an immense amount of British manufactures are conveyed to Persia. In short, all Asia is either English or Russian, or the debateable ground of English and Russian outposts. Again, one is a manufacturing and commercial people, opening its ports to the world; the other, jealous in matters of commerce as in politics, adopts not merely a system of protection, but in many cases one of absolute prohibition. She is glad to dispose of her raw produce, but will make no return.

There is the rivalry of different races and civilizations. The Slavonians are not in contact with the Celto-Romans; but there is a long frontier between the Slavonian and the German. The Russian peasant calls the latter a *dummy*. Now, of all the Germanic tribes, the Anglo-Saxon is the most complete antithesis of the Slavonian. He is pre-eminently the man of the western world, the man who has carried out to the fullest extent the instincts and the calling of the noble Germanic stock. His civilization is essentially one of great cities. There are in the British Isles thirteen cities, reckoning each more than a hundred thousand inhabitants; there are already seven in the United

States; there are eight more in British India; that is, in all, twenty-eight,—one-third of the cities of that rank in the world, inhabited by, or belonging to, Anglo-Saxons. There are but three such cities in all the vast empire of the Czar.

There is the rivalry of political and social institutions. This, indeed, is partially shared by the French; for there is more equality of ranks, more social democracy, in France than in England. But the Frenchman is at all times, and more especially under Louis Napoleon, accustomed to the omnipotence of the police, and to have his personal liberty interfered with in a way that would not be borne in England. It is the spirit of England that is essentially antipathetic to that of Russia. On the one side is a self-governing people, becoming, at every crisis in its history, more its own master, more worthy to be so, and more anxious to spread the boon to others; on the other, a people of serfs,—unhappy instrument in the hand of the Autocrat to crush every people within his reach who aspire after freedom.

The last element of antagonism that we shall mention is the most important. It is the difference of religion. This also is shared by France, who unfortunately prides herself on being the eldest daughter of the Church of Rome, and as such must regard with aversion the pretensions of the military Pope of the North. Most of the Roman Catholic Missionaries in the Levant are Frenchmen, and have frequently to complain of Russian intolerance and intrigues. But in this sphere, again, the Anglo-Saxon is the real antagonist of the orthodox Church: our Missionaries, or those of America, labour among all the Asiatic populations over which the Russian Empire and Russian Church desire to extend their sway. We have got the start of both bayonets and holy oil, and are pre-occupying the ground with moral influences such as neither of them can eradicate. We are becoming from year to year more emphatically the champions of religious liberty, while the Autocrat's despotism is becoming in the same proportion more and more ecclesiastical. Prince Menschikoff complained to the Porte of the labours of the American Missionaries, and would have gladly swept away all that had been done for religious liberty in the East during these last eight years. The antagonism of religion is, indeed, the most deep-rooted and persevering of all; and we live in an age which is beginning to feel its power. Unfortunately, as Russia understands the matter, religious disputes are not to be settled by religious weapons.

Apparently, it ought to have been a great object with the Russian Court to gain time, colonize its forests, and let its immense resources accumulate; while the construction of railways would have made its armies available for immediate service wherever wanted,—north, south, or west,—instead of having, as now, to drag themselves along a slow and wearying march, sometimes of many months' duration. We may hope, that the



precipitation which has brought on the present crisis has been providentially over-ruled, in order to give an effectual check to the advance of Russian ambition. It is impossible to review the events of the last hundred years,—with their significant commentary, the Czar's overtures to Sir H. Seymour,—without feeling that the tremendous conflict between the Englishman and the Russian must have arisen sooner or later. As it is, we have secured the help of the most formidable of the military powers, after Russia herself: nay, France has been the most forward of the two. The privileges she asked for the Latins at Bethlehem were the first occasion of the Sultan's difficulties with the Czar. Her fleet was first in the Greek seas; her Ambassadors used the most stringent terms when the combined fleet entered the Black Sea. With the natural reluctance of a commercial people to engage in war, and with a somewhat vague instinct of the desperate nature of the conflict if it should be finally entered upon, we have been, as it were, dragged into it; just as it was France that dragged all Europe into the Crusades. And now the sons of Richard Cœur de Lion and Philip Augustus stand in the East shoulder to shoulder, as they did seven hundred years ago. If the alliance is nominally in favour of the Crescent now, it is not the less true to the spirit of the Crusades; it is formed against the common enemy of the civil and religious liberties of Europe. The Christians of the East will be the first to profit by it; and it is to be hoped Philip will not abandon Richard this time.

There has been some unseemly levity in high places at the beginning of this war, some confidence in our own strength, that, however natural, would have been better placed in the righteousness of our cause. Moreover, the attitude of the press has been by no means uniformly worthy of this country. The leading Journal reflected the difficulties of the situation in the incoherence of its language,—one day declaiming against the Divan, and the next railing against the Czar. We trust there is more self-possession and more earnest consistency in the English mind, than a stranger would be led to infer from the perusal of its supposed organs. And we fervently desire, that, in peace or in war, the high calling of the British nation may be present to the thoughts of all its members. Let us not act in the spirit of mere selfish national rivalry, but with the strengthening and ennobling consciousness of a providential mission.

- ART. II.—1. *Homiletics; or, The Theory of Preaching.* By A. VINET. Translated from the French. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1853.
2. *A Letter to a Junior Methodist Preacher, concerning the general Course and Prosecution of his Studies in Christian Theology.* By JOHN HANNAH, D.D. Third Edition. London: John Mason. 1853.
3. *An Earnest Ministry the Want of the Times.* By JOHN ANGELL JAMES. Fifth Edition. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1841.

THE Pulpit—understanding it as the symbol of religious instruction and influence—cannot be too highly estimated. Nothing can equal it in importance, nothing compare with it in beneficial results. Secular education may diffuse useful knowledge, philosophy and science shed their light, and legislation confer its benefits; but these, in their bearing on the perfection and happiness of man, are no more to be compared with the Pulpit, than a glimmering star to the meridian sun. Doubtless, it has been in all ages the prime method of arousing the energies of the mind, and enriching it with exalted and just views of divine doctrines and morals; of rescuing the heart from the gnawings of a guilty conscience, and the tyranny of depraved passions; and of securing the existence and finest manifestation of personal and social virtue and happiness. The Pulpit

“(in the sober use  
Of its legitimate peculiar powers)  
Must stand acknowledg'd, while the world shall stand,  
The most important and effectual guard,  
Support, and ornament of Virtue's cause.  
There stands the messenger of truth: there stands  
The legate of the skies!—His theme divine,  
His office sacred, his credentials clear.  
By him the violated law speaks out  
Its thunders; and by him, in strains as sweet  
As angels use, the Gospel whispers peace.  
He 'stablishes the strong, restores the weak,  
Reclaims the wanderer, binds the broken heart,  
And, arm'd himself in panoply complete  
Of heavenly temper, furnishes with arms  
Bright as his own, and trains, by every rule  
Of holy discipline, to glorious war,  
The sacramental host of God's elect!”

Various and instructive are the aspects under which the Pulpit may be viewed. We might consider it in its history, from the earliest times down to the present; or as a divine instrument,

during all the dispensations of God's grace and truth, by which to influence the human mind, and form it to knowledge and rectitude. The dispensation of the Patriarchs had its preachers of righteousness, such as Enoch and Noah; and that of the Law had Moses and the Prophets. The Christian dispensation, founded by the *incarnate Son of God*, and infallibly set forth in the ministry and writings of his inspired Apostles, has its Ministers, (chosen by Christ himself,) whose great calling is to preach the Gospel to all nations. To mark this history, as it is furnished in sacred and ecclesiastical annals, would be as profitable as interesting, and would force upon us the conviction, that it is, in the judgment of the Infinite Intelligence, an instrument pre-eminently suited to the mental and moral necessities of mankind. The Pulpit might also be viewed in relation to the magnificent ends which are proposed to be accomplished by it, and its adaptation to those ends, together with the evidences which have already appeared of its successes and triumphs. Yet further, we might consider the formal variations, both as to matter and style, which, notwithstanding the substantial unity of the truth, have appeared therein during the different ages of the Church.

To enter on such a field, inviting as it is, and redolent of intellectual pleasure, is not our present purpose. Neither the history of the Pulpit, nor its philosophic aspect, nor its past results, come within the range of our intention. Our business will rather be, to give a brief sketch of the modern British Pulpit, as it is found in the leading Christian and Protestant denominations existing among us, and then to make such remarks and suggestions as may lead to its greater efficiency. The modern Pulpit has not reached its full energy; nor does it display all the beneficial uses to which it may, and ought to, be applied. Fairness and impartiality must be maintained. The interests of truth must not be sacrificed to a false delicacy. If sometimes we may seem to deal severely, it is the severity of friendship, employed to correct, if possible, certain existing defects, and to lead those who are engaged in the sacred calling of the Ministry, to a more careful and practical consideration of the duties which devolve upon them, and of the manner in which those duties should be continuously discharged.

Before, however, we direct attention to the immediate object of this paper, it may be necessary to observe, that all remarks directly bearing on the immoralities which may often have disfigured the occupants of the pulpit are purposely excluded. The truth is universally admitted, that an office so sacred should be held only by those whose characters are, to say the least, outwardly consistent. Though occasion for severe remark on this topic may easily be found, yet we deem it sufficient to make only this passing allusion, knowing full well, that the moral sense of the public will both readily perceive and condemn the

inconsistencies of a Minister's personal character, whether such inconsistencies be marked by flagrant evils, or by those only that are regarded as fashionable and refined.

The first in order is the Established Church of England. In this venerable ecclesiastical system, a wide diversity obtains, both in the substance and style of preaching. However much some of its indiscriminating admirers and advocates may boast of its unity, it is notorious that parties exist among its Ministers, as different from each other in sentiment, as truth is from error, and in positions, not only of difference, but of direct antagonism. True it is, that the old party of quiet moralists; of Ministers who deem it sufficient to give a discourse on the common duties of life, having in it more of Seneca than of Christ, and indicating a better acquaintance with the Ethics of Aristotle than with the glowing and energetic doctrine of the Apostles of Christianity, is less numerous than formerly. Still some of them may be found in the cathedrals, and college chapels, and in some of the churches of the large towns; but more especially in rural villages. Happily, indeed, this cold and moonlight instruction is on the decline, and striking indications of a beneficial change are manifested. During the last half century, or more, this change has been gradually developed in the evangelical character of the pulpits of the Established Church. In the ministry of such men as William Romaine, John Newton, Charles Simeon, and Richard Cecil, came the revival of a more scriptural theology, and the consequent revival of religious life. Their preaching may be as favourably contrasted with what then generally prevailed among their clerical brethren, as the genial influence of spring with the chill and death of winter. The one was like a sunbeam, the other like an iceberg. And since the days of these devoted and earnest men, the doctrines they proclaimed, and the piety they exemplified, have been steadily on the increase amongst the Clergy. Many honoured names might be given, but we shall mention only two,—Melville of London, and M'Neile of Liverpool. Though not willing to endorse all their theological tenets, we cheerfully confess them to be, in the main, Evangelical. We simply name these popular Ministers as occupying the foremost rank, and exerting a wide-spread influence, amongst the Evangelical party. Numbers of the junior Clergy adopt them as their models.\*

---

\* The names of these eminent Ministers may be allowed to stand together, as they both do signal honour to the most influential party in the Establishment. Yet their position in the Church, the nature of their gifts, and the personal characteristics of their ministry, are essentially different, and may be more easily contrasted than compared. Though truly evangelical in his teaching, Melville belongs properly to that order of independent Preachers of which the Church of England has produced so many learned and eloquent examples; while M'Neile is to be regarded as the type of an earnest, practical, and useful class, and more or less acknowledged as the leader of a powerful party. This contrast is well marked in their personal gifts and ministrations. The one excels in

With all our admiration of the Evangelical party, we do not regard them as being faultless. Their pulpit ministrations too frequently want substance, and are often disfigured by a crude Calvinism on the one hand, and a confused Millenarianism on the other. No doubt they evidence a seriousness of spirit, a fragrance of piety that seems like air wafted from a grove of spices, an earnestness of manner that shows a true regard to the spiritual interests of the people: nevertheless, their discourses lack a definite and substantial theology. From their feebleness of thought, one would be almost tempted to think that they considered the mere superficial exhibition of the elementary truths of the Gospel all that was needed to ministerial efficiency; whereas pulpit discourses should evidence deliberate and close study, be enriched with Christian truth in its clearness and vigour, and display a becoming amplitude of scriptural treasures. The importance of the subject, and the claims of the people, demand that such should be the case. Extremes are doubtless to be avoided,—a redundant fulness on the one hand, as well as a meagre poverty on the other. The Evangelical Clergy would do well to give themselves to the hard and diligent study of the massive writings of such men as Isaac Barrow, and Bishops Reynolds and Hopkins,—not, however, to adopt the same elaborate mode of sermonizing, but to enrich their own dis-

the science, and the other in the art, of preaching. The mind of Melville is cast in the noble mould of Barrow, and the masculine Preachers of the seventeenth century. To listen to him is an intellectual treat, even more than an evangelical feast. The key-note of his discourse is struck in his opening sentence, and the elaborate strain is equally sustained to the moment of its full and perfect close. In the closet we study his composition like an organic work of nature,—admire the adaptation of its parts, and glow with pleasure in view of its just symmetry and vital beauty. M'Neile is emphatically, and in the popular and proper sense, a *Preacher*. The pulpit is to him, what the tribune is to the orator,—a throne of power; but his power is chiefly manifested when the character of his audience corresponds to the elements of his preaching, which is suitably addressed to the average class of hearers. To a choice assembly, the science of Melville, and the imagination of Irving, would come with tokens of far superior greatness. Without any remarkable reach of intellect, M'Neile has almost unlimited influence over the opinions and affections of an ordinary and stated congregation. His accomplishments are numerous; his person is attractive and commanding in a high degree. His voice obeys him like a perfect instrument in the hands of a master. His attitudes and gestures are full of grace,—perhaps, too studied to affect pleasurably some minds, who look to the pulpit, at least, for simplicity and entire forgetfulness of self; but not the less telling on the bulk of hearers, with whom it is often the readiest symbol of superior talent. These are, perhaps, little matters in themselves, but they are powerful in combination, and in the pulpit efforts of M'Neile they are marshalled and directed with consummate tact: with him, not the pointing of a finger, nor the inflection of a tone, is lost. Yet these alone would not insure so eminent and (still less) so useful a success. The preacher is animated by the genuine spirit of the Gospel. From many of his views of scriptural interpretation we are compelled to dissent, as unsound and misleading; but the doctrine of salvation by faith, we believe, he has always simply and zealously enforced. Often inconsistent with himself, he is yet uniformly faithful to this great practical truth of Christianity. His influence is chiefly local and personal, but we rejoice that it is, for the most part, pure and salutary; and if not entitled to the character of a great Divine, few so well as he deserve the praise of an earnest Evangelist, and a champion successfully "contending for the faith."



courses, and imbue them with an evangelism that is at once intellectual, vigorous, and replete with unction. An infusion of such old elements would be of the highest service to religion, and would also redeem the Established Clergy from the oft-repeated, and perhaps just, complaint, of being poor Preachers,—poor in the sense of mental energy. Ingots of gold are more precious than a few scattered grains. It is a serious fault with many of the Clergy that they attach too little importance to the pulpit, and neglect to apply themselves with sufficient diligence in preparation for it. The pulpit is too often subordinated to the reading-desk, and the ministration of the truth less regarded than the ritual. Both should be respected according to their claims. Whilst the spirit of devotion breathes its wishes to heaven, divine truths—like pointed arrows—should be affectionately and earnestly directed to the people. The man of God in the pulpit should rise to all the dignity and zeal of one who has interests of infinite value to secure. Truly does the pious George Herbert remark on the Parson's preaching, "The pulpit is his joy and his throne." Were the rising Evangelical Clergy careful to combine richness of biblical truth with pointedness of style and earnestness of address, their profiting would appear to many; their sun would rise to a higher altitude in the ecclesiastical firmament, and shed a brighter and more beneficial radiance.

About twenty years ago, amidst the growing popularity and successful labours of the Evangelical party, there arose another class of Ministers in the Establishment, whose religious opinions are directly antagonistic to theirs. They are the Tractarians. Did it accord with our purpose, it would be interesting to trace the causes of such a development. We simply suggest the inquiry whether the want of a more strenuous regard to the outward form of religion, on the part of the Evangelicals, was not amongst the causes which brought it into existence. There can be no question but that, where the doctrines of grace are preached without a distinct and continued enforcement of their practical tendency, such preaching leads to Antinomian carelessness: outward religious ordinances are comparatively despised, and the duties of fasting, and alms-giving, and visitation of the sick, are almost entirely forgotten. Hence the doctrines of grace, though designed and fitted to be most fruitful of practical godliness, and to be embodied in an outward form of moral loveliness and consistency, have often, in consequence of their partial and one-sided exhibition, failed to accomplish their noble ends, and sometimes have even been the occasion of the development of error. Not only should the truths of the Bible be presented in their true character and import, but in their mutual relations, according to the *αναλογία πίστεως*.

But, whatever may be the causes of Tractarianism, its exist-

ence is a stubborn fact, and many of the pulpits of the Establishment are occupied by its strenuous advocates. The first promoters of this heresy may have sought what they considered a purer and more perfect outward form of Christianity; but they neglected the divine and spiritual life, which could alone give it animation and value. Ritualism was made to take the place of vital Christianity. The form, graceful in many of its parts, was destitute of soul. It was a marble statue, rather than a living power. Deviating into the path of error, they very soon adopted sentiments thoroughly anti-Protestant, and which, if followed to their logical consequences, must lead them into the bosom of Popery. Their teaching substitutes Popish dogmas and practices in lieu of pure Christian truth and divine charity, and demonstrates them to be the occupiers of pulpits which they cannot hold with consistency and honour; their teaching being in direct opposition to the Articles of faith to which they have subscribed, and consequently in open violation of their solemn vows. The pulpit, occupied by such Ministers, not only gives an uncertain sound, but ignores the very principles on which the Established Church was raised, and levels a blow at its foundations.

True, there is great plausibility, the garb of extraordinary sanctity, the display of a fascinating ritualism, "the dim religious light," and the putting forth of energetic action in the spread of pernicious error. But all this only tends to deceive the minds of the unwary, and to mislead the simple and unsuspecting. Whatever may be the temporary success of Tractarianism in the Anglican pulpits, we have the utmost confidence as to its ultimate overthrow. It is like the dark clouds that intercept the brightness of the sun. But the sun is above the clouds. Scriptural truth will prevail against every form of error. Meanwhile, it is the imperative duty of every faithful Minister of the Establishment to contend earnestly for the faith transmitted by their forefathers, and sealed by their blood; to preach the truth as it is in Jesus, with the same point, plainness, and unction, as good old Latimer. The Church of England gives evidence of increased vigour, and proclaims the Protestant truth—which is both her tower of strength, and her crown of glory—with increased success. It is pleasing to find Mr. James, in his admirable book on an "Earnest Ministry," bearing his emphatic testimony in favour of the Establishment, and urging it as a motive to his Dissenting brethren to augmented earnestness and labour. He certainly is not, in this case, a prejudiced witness.

"The Church of England is in earnest. Many of us can recollect the time when it was not so. A pervading secularity characterized her Clergy, a drowsy indifference her people. If the former got their tithes, and ate, drank, and were merry; and the latter got christening, confirmation, and the sacrament when they died; it was all they cared

for. The only thing that moved either of them to a pang of zeal, was the coming of the Methodists into the parish; and when these were mobbed away, they relapsed again into their former apathy. Exceptions there were,—bright and blessed ones; but they were only exceptions. Thank God, it is not so now! A vivifying wind has swept over the valley of dry bones, and an army, not only of living, but of life-giving, men has sprung up. Venn, Berridge, and Romaine, Newton, Cecil, and Simeon, have lived, and have awakened a new spirit in the Church to which they belonged. Look at that Church as she is now to be seen,—full of energy and earnestness; divided, it is true, into parties, as to theological opinion, to a considerable extent Romanized in her spirit, and aggressive in her designs; but instinct with life, and a great deal of it life of the best kind. Even the orthodox and the Puseyite Clergy are all now active,—preaching, catechizing, visiting the sick, instituting and superintending schools. The day is happily gone by, when the taunt of fox-hunting, play-going, ball-frequenting Parsons could be, with justice, thrown at the Clergy of the State Church. They are no longer to be found in those scenes of folly and vanity, but at the bed-side of the sick man, or in the cottage of the poor one. We must rejoice in their labours and in their success, except when their object and aim are to crush Dissenters. There are very many among them of the *true* apostolic succession, in doctrine, spirit, and devotedness; many whose piety and zeal we should do well to emulate; many with whom it is among the felicities of my life to be united in the bonds of private friendship, and public co-operation. Sincerely and cordially attached to their Church, they are labouring, in season and out of season, to promote its interests. Who can blame them? Instead of this, let us imitate them. For zeal and devotedness they are worthy of it. I know their labours, and am astonished at them.”—Pp. 253-255.

The Presbyterian pulpit must now be considered. Within the narrow limits of half a century, *Moderatism*, so called, generally prevailed among the Clergy of the Presbyterian bodies. Robertson and Blair exerted, in their day, a wide influence, and considerably moulded the sentiments and style of the Scottish pulpits,—an influence by no means favourable to evangelical truth and piety. Their preaching was more like a stagnant pool than the river of life. A happy change was to appear,—a warm and masculine theology was to supersede their vapid morality. The spiritual winter was to be followed by the bursting beauties of a spiritual spring. The late Dr. Chalmers was, under God, a powerful instrument in effecting this beneficial change. It is pleasing to witness the triumph of evangelical truth and life in his own mind, constituting him an angel of good to the churches of his country. In the early period of his ministry, it is true, he was no better than Robertson and Blair. For a while, he made religion subservient to philosophy, not philosophy subservient to religion. His sermons were rather finished essays on outward morality, than expositions of the doctrine of the Cross,—eloquent denunciations of vicious practices, rather than manifestations

of divine truth to the conscience. But when the "truth of the Gospel of Christ" came, "with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power," to his own mind,—when Christianity became a living and an active principle in his own heart,—when there was a spiritual revolution in his inward thoughts and feelings, he immediately gave evidence of the marvellous transition, not only in his personal conduct, but in his public ministrations. With all the earnestness of one who had made a new discovery in theological science, he began to proclaim the "glorious Gospel of the blessed God." With a mind full of the treasures of science and classical lore, still more enriched with the priceless treasures of saving "grace and truth,"—possessed of a fervid and brilliant eloquence,—great in energy, and resolute in enterprise,—he devoted himself to the high interests of spiritual religion, and determined to "know nothing among men save Jesus Christ and him crucified." He took "up the reproach of the Gospel, and bound it as a crown around his brow." No longer treating religion as he would a problem in Euclid, or an experiment in chemistry, or a law in mental and moral science, or a landscape, stretching itself, in serene or wild beauty and magnificence, before his eye; but regarding it as a DIVINE LIFE, he sought to enthrone it in the thoughts and affections of the people. His word was with power. The blasts of his silver trumpet resounded through the mountains and vales of his father-land. Some were startled and enraged; many hailed his ministry with joy, and saw in it the revival of a living and transforming Christianity. It was the day of Scotland's religious awakening and prosperity.

In paying this tribute to the evangelical character and influence of a departed great man, let us not be supposed to overlook or undervalue the labours of some of his contemporaries. Other faithful and godly Ministers exerted similar influence; but certainly none so extensively as Dr. Chalmers. Rich are the fruits that now appear. Whether we look into the Scottish Establishment, the Free Church, the United Presbyterians, or the sturdy Cameronians, we find noble examples of ministerial efficiency. For the rich evangelical truth that underlies their discourses, combined with their seriousness of spirit and earnestness of manner, they are entitled to the warmest commendation. This is true of many, not of all. The improvement, though general, is not universal. The leaven of Moderatism, in a greater or less degree, still remains in the generality of the Presbyterian Churches. If it be said of numbers of their Clergy, that their ministrations are spirit and life,—that they spread a lovely Paradise of truth, rich in the glory of Jesus, and fruitful in the graces of the Holy Spirit,—it may yet be said of others, that their ministrations are stiff and lifeless, reminding one of the coldness and desolation of winter.

It is natural to suppose that, with the revival of Christian life,

there would be an increased consideration of Christian truth. So it proved; and, as one consequence, *rigid* Calvinism is becoming *effete*. Chalmers himself, although he held the Calvinistic creed, presented that creed under a new phase, and greatly softened down its stern and rigorous character; so much so, that it can scarcely be called "Calvinism." Whilst he held a limited view of the atonement, he insisted on the universal offer of the benefits of that atonement, and maintained the positive guilt of all who refused to accept it. This method, adopted by himself and followers, was intended to preserve, what they call, "*logical consistency*" (we should say, consistency with the "Confession of Faith"). We have found some of them puzzled—not to use any stronger term—how to reconcile their view of a limited atonement for sin with the universal offer of the saving benefits of that atonement. A truer logic and clearer metaphysics will, ere long, it is hoped, lead them to the scriptural view, that the provision of salvation must be as extensive and as real as the offer of it. Indeed, this more true and scriptural logic has already developed itself in the theological views of the late celebrated Dr. Balmer,\* Professor of Theology in the United Presbyterian Church; and as clearly also, and even more decidedly, in the Morrisonian school.

The Congregationalists must now be considered. They have an honourable parentage, and can boast of a galaxy of great and good Preachers. If we allow, what by some is still disputed, that the Nonconformists in the time of Charles II. are their legitimate parents, we may well congratulate them on their origin, and almost envy the glory which they inherit. The succession has been more or less maintained until now, if not in majesty of intellect and wealth of thought, yet in evangelical teaching, and a serene and deep piety.

Great, indeed, has been the loss recently sustained by the Congregationalists in the removal of some of their most distinguished ornaments. They are no more in this world. Having fulfilled their earthly vocation, they now enjoy their reward, and know the mysterious secrecies and wonders of what to us is invisible. Among these is Pye Smith, who, with a diversified scholarship, an extensive acquaintance with science, a

\* "It is, I apprehend, a truth admitting of no doubt, that the Almighty *wishes* the salvation of all. But, if so, the sacrifice of Christ must have been *intended* for all; for it is on the basis of that sacrifice that the universal invitation of the Gospel is founded, and, without the sacrifice, the invitation would never have been made. And why, then, are not all saved? Why, I might ask in return, did Adam fall, when God *wished* him to stand? &c. You seem to think that the atonement was accepted only for a limited number. I suspect that, in the term *accepted*, there is an ambiguity similar to that which attaches to the word *intended*, when used in reference to this subject. In my opinion, however, it would be more accurate to say, that it was accepted for all; but that those only will be saved by it, who, by faith, accept it for themselves."—*Balmer's Lectures*, vol. i., p. 49. See also, in the same volume, his Lecture on the "Gospel Call," p. 459.



patient and deep research, combined evangelical soundness in doctrine, and the richness of tried piety. Wardlaw, also, whose religion was to him as a second nature, and whose mind, if not of the same compass as Pye Smith's, was quick and logical, penetrating and luminous, and successfully employed in the defence of the Gospel. There is yet another, more recent still in his departure from us,—the venerable and much-loved Jay. His excellencies are as diversified and fragrant as the roses he was wont to cultivate.\* Though not equal to his contemporaries just named, either in natural or acquired abilities, yet in piety he was as beautiful, and, for efficiency in the pulpit, and extent of religious influence, superior to both. Each in his sphere shed "the lustre of an evening star, and reflected upon the Church the glory of that great Sun of Righteousness, in whose attraction it had been their delight, through a long, and holy, and useful life, to revolve."

If a few bright luminaries have been withdrawn from the Congregational firmament, others yet remain. Ministers are still amongst them who approve themselves worthy successors of their honourable and godly forefathers, who display the same richness of evangelical truth, the same fervour of piety, the same simplicity of aim, the same devotedness to the interests of religion. Too much praise can scarcely be given to such men as Dr. Raffles, and John Angell James, and Dr. Leifechild, and Thomas Binney, and James Parsons. The mantle of their ascended Elijahs has fallen upon them. But these "elect ones" cannot be considered the types of the prevailing order of the Dissenting Clergy; they are rather connecting links between the past and the present, having, however, more of the former than the latter. Bright is their example, and beneficial their influence. Would that we could persuade ourselves that the rising Ministry imbibed their spirit, and were ambitious to emulate their evangelical and earnest ministrations! But this we cannot do. Instead of renewing their strength like the eagle, they show signs of weakness, and indicate diminished power and adaptation to the great ends of the Christian Ministry. Whilst the Clergy of the English Establishment are improving in the qualities requisite for ministerial success, those among the Dissenters are rather on the decline. Say we this from any undue preference of the one to the other? By no means. Vital Christianity has been so largely promoted by the manifold labours of this respectable body, that we cannot but desire the increase of its usefulness, and regret the appearance of any symptoms of decay. Such symptoms, we believe, are really developed. The fine old school of Dissent is in danger of passing

---

\* Mr. Jay was remarkably partial to roses, of which he had in his garden, as he once informed us, no less than one hundred and twenty varieties.

away; and a new school is seeking to rise into its place. The masculine thought, the profound deference to Holy Scripture, the pointedness of address, and the godly concern for the salvation of men, which were the distinguishing marks of the old Nonconforming Ministers, are now ominously wanting among some of those who profess to be their successors.

We shall not stay to inquire whether any of the modern Dissenting Clergy are so deeply immersed in politics, as to give proof of an earnestness in these matters, equal to what they display in religion. Nor shall we attempt to settle the question, how far such zeal is of advantage to ministerial character or ministerial usefulness. Willingly do we leave the case of those who err in this matter to the condemnation which they will assuredly receive from some of their own gifted and pious brethren. Our business is with the pulpit. How does this present itself among the Congregationalists? Is its general tendency to an increased, or a diminished, efficiency? We regret to have to record our conviction that its tendency is downward. A speculative, rather than a dogmatic, theology is rising into the ascendant amongst some of them. In a few instances, there are signs of a departure from what are justly styled "the evangelical peculiarities;" and, if not a near approach to the modern Socinianism of the American Channing, certainly a growing sympathy with German Neology. With these, as with the loose German theologians, the Scriptures are brought down from their high ground of plenary inspiration; and principles of hermeneutics are adopted, as dangerous as they are false, as blighting to man's peace as they are delusive to his mind. The doctrine of real atonement for sin, by the shedding of the Redeemer's blood, is being lowered to a mere exhibition of love, as a motive to constrain; the eternity of future punishments, notwithstanding the unanswerable production of their departed great light, Dr. Winter Hamilton, is giving place to the Winchesterian notion of restoration after limited punishment, or to the more modern one of absolute annihilation. The specific and direct agency of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men, and in their formation to a divine character, is in danger of being supplanted by the notion that the truth *per se* accomplishes this change.\* Preachers of this sort, to whatever denomination they may belong, are clouds without water; blights that darken heaven, and smite the earth

\* In confirmation of our remarks, we may refer to Mr. White's book, entitled, "Life in Christ;" also to Mr. Dobney's book on Future Punishment, and to the more recent "Lectures" of Mr. Ham. We give an extract from the Rev. Mr. Davis's (recently of Bristol) Letter to the Rev. J. P. Ham: "While you confined yourself to your views on the nature of man and of future punishment, [annihilation,] and satisfied yourself with those modes of promulgating them to which none can object, I felt no inclination to interfere with you; because your views on these subjects, though in my opinion erroneous, yet are not deadly. That you held some peculiarities on the atonement, I had heard; but

stars of disastrous influence. On this point, Mr. James not only expresses his fears, but gives an earnest and affectionate warning.

"Education," says he, "will no longer be confined to literature and natural science. A disposition and determination are formed to explore the world of mind, as well as that of matter, and to give to subjective studies a place, and that a very high one, perhaps above the objective ones. Psychology is now, and will be still more so, the favourite pursuit of great multitudes of reflective intellects. The mind of Germany is operating with power and success upon the mind of England, to an extent which is surprising, and, in some views of the case, alarming. It is, one should think, impossible to trace the progress of Transcendentalism from the time of Kant to that of Hegel, and to see how, as it diverged more and more widely from the metaphysics of our land, it has associated itself with Rationalism in theology, and led on to Pantheism in philosophy, and not feel some apprehension for the result of its introduction to this country. Perhaps the practical character of the English understanding will be one of our safeguards against a system which, to the great multitude, must ever remain a matter of mere scientific speculation. It may, however, be feared that some of our young Ministers, and our students in theology, especially those of speculative habits, captivated by the daring boldness, the intellectual vigour, and the theoretic attractions of the great German philosophers, may too adventurously launch forth on this dangerous ocean, and make shipwreck of their doctrinal simplicity and practical usefulness. Let them be assured that neither the Transcendentalism of Kant, nor the Eclecticism of Cousin, is a safe guide for men who would be useful in saving souls. . . . We would by no means contend that there is nothing in the industry of German investigation, in its method of analysis, in its subjective taste, or even in the systems which are the fruits of its researches, which may not be borrowed with advantage by ourselves; but against that willing and entire surrender of the understanding to a school, the masters of which have left us no Gospel but a fable, and no God but nature, which some in this land are beginning to manifest, we must raise an emphatic and protesting voice."—Pp. 243–245.

We could name Dissenting pulpits which, only a few years ago, were occupied by men of noble intellects, the richest Evangelism, and fine ministerial parts, that are now occupied by

little did I think you had wandered so far from the truth as to give up the proper sacrifice of Christ's death, and to teach that atonement only means *our* reconciliation to God, *on being informed that he loves us*, and that Christ only died *for us*, 'because, in showing mankind this lovely image of God, he fell a victim to the wickedness of self-seeking men, who put him to a violent death!' Alas, alas! into what depths have you not fallen! And now that you have not only sunk into this miserable Socinianism, but have led with you many poor souls, who, I believe, know not whither they are going, or where they now are, and are sending your emissaries to spread these arrows of death amongst the congregations, the time for silence is past; and it becomes every man who is indeed a truth-lover to arise, and contend earnestly for 'the faith once delivered to the saints.'" In one of our interviews with Mr. Jay, not very long before his last illness, he expressed his deep regret that German Neology was getting among some of the Dissenting Ministers, but said that he should still hold to his three "R's,"—"Ruin by Adam, Redemption by Christ, and Regeneration by the Holy Spirit."

those whose sermons exhibit a fearful lack of the evangelical truth and earnestness, which distinguished their illustrious predecessors. Of course, they are not to blame for inferiority of intellect; but they are for inferiority of doctrine and spirit. We should like to see the return of former days with them, in the manifestation of the power and unction of the Nonconformists of the seventeenth century. The junior Dissenting Clergy would do well not to yield themselves, so much as they appear disposed to do, to what is called, "the spirit of the age;" but to seek, rather, the spirit of Howe, and Charnock, and Baxter; and not to waste their time and thoughts amidst the gilded summer clouds of modern fashionable literature,—clouds as unsubstantial as they are attractive,—but, rather, to reap the fruitful fields which their fathers have left them as an inheritance.

Willingly do we bear testimony, that there are yet numbers of the Dissenting Clergy who are faithful servants of their Divine Master; who are as sound in the essentials of Christian doctrine, as they are pious in character, and are ever found complying with the apostolic injunction, "Study to be quiet, and to do your own business." Mr. James's advice to his brethren deserves special notice. He is himself an example of what he recommends.

"Dissenters of England, and especially Dissenting Ministers, I say, therefore, unto you, Be in earnest: first of all, and chief of all, in attachment to the doctrines of Evangelism, to the creed of Protestantism, to the great principles which God has employed, in every age and country where true religion has had existence, to vitalize a dead, and purify a corrupt, world. Be it your prayer, your endeavour, your hallowed ambition, to possess a Ministry of competent learning, and especially of soundly evangelical sentiment; a Ministry which, in the simplicity of their discourses and the intensity of their zeal, the fervour of their piety and the all-comprehending extent of their labours, shall vie with the best specimens of the Clergy of the Church of England. There is earnestness among *them*; and if we would not be swallowed up in the rising tide of their zeal, let us meet it with a corresponding intensity. Let each Minister, in his own separate and individual sphere of action, set himself to work, and put forth all his energies, without waiting for combination with others. Not that I speak against combination. We have far too little of it, and this is our weakness. In polity we are too independent, and should be vastly improved, as regards our internal condition and our external influence, if we were more compact. But as to ministerial earnestness, we need not wait for others: each man can do what he wills, and may do much, though no other man did any thing. Ministerial activity, like Christian piety, is a matter of individual obligation; and no one is so dependent upon his neighbours, as that he needs to halt till they are ready to march with him."—Pp. 257, 258.

It is time to pass on to the Wesleyan Pulpit. Although it has not been in existence much more than a century, it has

accomplished, both in Britain and throughout the world, an amount of good beyond arithmetical calculation. Since the days of the Apostles, no pulpit ministrations have been more successful than the Wesleyan, in promoting the true interests of religion. For its rapid and wide-spread successes, it is perfectly unique in the history of Christendom. No overweening preferences dictate this remark. The fact is broadly before the world, and Methodism at this day, through the power of its agencies, is the most influential religious denomination in existence. The Wesleys and their coadjutors were splendid examples of the right kind of preaching. Their sermons were as clear as a sunbeam, and also as genial. Thoroughly evangelical in doctrine, rich in the personal experience of that doctrine, constrained by divine love to proclaim it to others, intent only on preaching "Jesus Christ, and him crucified," possessed, generally, of masculine intellects, of warm hearts, and a simple and pointed style of address,—they went forth to fulfil their great mission, and "the hand of the Lord was with them." They "spoke—sometimes with a startling conciseness, sometimes with an overwhelming copiousness—of heaven, of hell, of eternity, of the power, and justice, and mercy of God, of an ample redemption, of an immediate release from guilt and danger, and of a present fruition of the divine favour. The style and manner of these Preachers seemed like a clearing of the clouds from the heavens, so that the sun in his strength might shine upon the dead earth."

Nor has Wesleyan Methodism ever wanted Preachers of the same genuine stamp. From its commencement until now, it has supplied some of the choicest specimens of pulpit efficiency. Such men as Joseph Benson, whose evangelical eloquence rushed like the mountain-torrent; and Richard Watson, whose thoughts were like the conceptions of angels,—whose imagination, abounding alike in beautiful and sublime imagery, was always subordinate to a healthy and vigorous judgment,—whose spirit was pervaded by deep piety, and whose entire mien was dignified and Christian; and David M'Nicoll, whose robust understanding, fine taste, and poetic fancy, were constantly sanctified to the great ends of the ministry;—were Ministers of whom the Wesleyans have reason to boast as the glory of their churches. Methodism has supplied another order of Ministers, —an order, though not so eloquent as Benson and Bradburn, nor so majestic in thought as Watson, nor so able and comprehensive as M'Nicoll, nor so learned as Clarke,—yet, possessed of rich Gospel truth, and employing right words, and animated by a soul glowing with the love and zeal of a seraph, eminently successful in winning men to Christ. Their word was as forceful as lightning: it aroused, alarmed, and subdued the people, like a crash of thunder. The late David Stoner is



their type. And men of pulpit power, equal to any of their predecessors, are still to be found amongst them. There is one especially, yet living, who may be justly pronounced the first Preacher Methodism ever produced, and, for all the great ends of the ministry, one of the most admirable examples that the ancient or modern pulpit can furnish:—we need hardly mention the name of Dr. Bunting. For clear conception of scriptural truth, fulness and vigour of thought, compactness and force of argument, correctness and simplicity of style, and powerful and overwhelming appeals to the conscience, he is entitled to rank amongst the most distinguished of Preachers. In his palmy days, we are told, that his preaching was absolutely irresistible, commanding alike the judgment and the feelings of his audience, and eminently conducive to the lofty purposes of his sacred calling. Without flattery, it may be said of him, taking him all in all, that he is the *facile princeps* of Preachers. Other living examples might be named, who are richly endowed with high mental and spiritual qualifications, and are quite equal to the best specimens of other Churches, and, in some respects, superior.\*

Unqualified praise, however, cannot be awarded to the Wesleyan Clergy. Some of them are defective in what constitute the prime qualities of the pulpit. There are even indications of

---

\* We have purposely refrained from quoting other names to illustrate the living Ministry of the Wesleyan Church; but as this sheet is passing through the press, the melancholy tidings reach us of the death of Dr. Newton; and we cannot allow the occasion to pass without a brief tribute to the memory of the departed, on a page where it may so appropriately appear. Robert Newton has "finished his course" in the fullness of age. Like his venerable friend and survivor mentioned in the text, for upwards of half a century he served the Church of Christ with unwearied zeal and eminent success; and perhaps no section of that Church in modern times has been blessed by the contemporary labours of two such men. While the profound genius and wisdom of the one largely contributed to mature and consolidate the Wesleyan system, then providentially settling into a distinctive Church-communion; the remarkable activity and faithful preaching of the other, blessed with unusual success, served to recruit and animate the ranks of Methodism in all parts of the country. The extent of Dr. Newton's labours, in connexion with the abundance of their fruits, would form an interesting chapter of ministerial biography. Between his own more stated services, he held himself at the call of congregations, near and remote, and rendered valuable aid to the cause of religious charity on almost innumerable occasions. On the Missionary platform he was remarkable for his successful advocacy. In the pulpit he was distinguished by evangelical simplicity and power. In either sphere of action he manifested some very unusual gifts. Wherever he appeared, and whatever assembly he addressed, the same attractive qualities attended him. Of lofty and noble presence, and a demeanour almost grand in its simplicity, it was a positive delight to see him rise into his place, to mark the ease of his bearing, and the natural majesty of his appearance. When he spoke, the spell was deepened, and not broken. His voice was of the finest order, and his action full of unstudied grace. He was the orator of nature far more than any we have seen or heard: the fervour of zeal, and not the rules of art, developed all his gifts. Though popular in a remarkable degree, there was nothing meretricious, nothing coarse, nothing violent in his appeals. He delivered the message of the Gospel with earnestness, as to perishing men; but with becoming dignity, as an Ambassador for God. It is pleasing to know, that, throughout his whole career, his simplicity remained uncorrupted, and his zeal unabated; and that nothing was allowed to divert him from the one object of his life,—the simple preaching of the cross of Christ.

a downward tendency amongst a few of the rising Ministry. We hope that by a timely check it may be effectually counteracted. Having had opportunities of hearing some of the younger Ministers, we have detected a departure from what has always constituted the glory and success of the Wesleyan pulpit. The jealous interest we take in the strength and progress of Methodism, and the claims of justice, demand that we emphatically declare our solemn conviction that danger threatens,—that some of the junior Preachers are abandoning the old style of clear religious instruction and faithful warning, and adopting one that is feeble and frothy, having more of figure than of thought, more of fancy than of truth, more of a false and tawdry picturing, than of the manifestation of the Gospel to the understanding and the conscience. If they are not like some of the Dissenters in their speculative tendencies, they are approaching them in the love of what is ignorantly called “Intellectualism,” and fine preaching—that which shall please the people, whatever may become of their immortal natures. They are defective in substance and point, and in direct and personal appeal to the conscience. The evangelical doctrines—the plain and earnest preaching of which were, under God, instrumental in raising Methodism to its present position, and are still needed for its continuance and extension—are not the staple of their ministrations. If pleasing, rather than profiting,—if the worthless applause which they secure, rather than the glory of Christ,—be the ends at which they aim, verily they have their reward. We would fain hope that only few come under this censure, and that even they, ere long, will obtain wisdom enough to give their days and nights to the diligent study of the writings of John Wesley, and others of kindred spirit, and form themselves after his excellent model.\*

Just censure has been administered to the few: let us not withhold the praise due to the many. The vast majority of Ministers among the Wesleyans deserve high commendation. They are stars of propitious influence. If they excite not a

---

\* In one of his remarkable prefaces, the following passage occurs:—

“I could even now write as floridly and rhetorically as even the admired Dr. B——, but I dare not; because I seek the honour that cometh of God only.....I should purposely decline, what many admire, an highly ornamental style. I cannot admire French oratory; I despise it from my heart. Let those that please be in raptures at the pretty elegant sentences of Massillon, or Bourdaloue; but give me the plain, nervous style of Dr. South, Dr. Bates, or Mr. John Howe. And for elegance show me any French writer who exceeds Dean Young, or Mr. Seed. Let who will admire the French frippery, I am still for the plain, sound English.

“I think a preacher or a writer of sermons has lost his way when he imitates any of the French orators, even the most famous of them. Only let his language be plain, proper, and clear, and it is enough. God himself has told us how to speak, both as to the matter and the manner: ‘If any man speak,’ in the name of God, ‘let him speak as the oracles of God;’ and if he would imitate any part of these above the rest, let it be the First Epistle of St. John.”—*Wesley's Works*, vol. vi., pp. 186, 187.

wondrous gaze, still they successfully pursue their course. They are held in the right hand of Him who kindled up their brightness, and commanded them to let their light shine before men. Large is the number of such godly Ministers. They are not "popular" in the common acceptation of the term, nor much known beyond the circles in which they respectively move; not distinguished by any great mental endowments: yet they are men of good common sense, thoroughly understand the truth of the Gospel, are endued with living and practical piety, and, despite of fatigues and hardships, successfully prosecute the duties of their sacred calling. Faithful indeed are such men, and worthy of all honour;—they are the sinews and strength of the Methodist body.

It is time to bring to a close our remarks on the pulpits of the various leading Protestant denominations of Britain, and to suggest a few topics for the serious consideration of all Ministers of the Gospel. Seeing such an array of ministerial agency, knowing the peculiar adaptation of the pulpit to the important ends for which it has been instituted, the question naturally occurs, How is it that the pulpit is not more efficient? The fact is undeniable, that the Clergy of all denominations make no advancement on the surface population. This is as startling as it is true. How comes it, therefore? Is it not generally admitted, that the preaching of the Gospel is the divinely appointed instrument in the regeneration of the human species, and in bringing them to loyal subjection and obedience to HIM, who is King of kings, and Lord of lords? And yet, in Britain, where preaching prevails more than in any other country, there is comparatively little success. How is this to be accounted for? Without laying claim to any peculiar wisdom, or dogmatically stating our opinions, we may enumerate some of the causes which, in our judgment, hinder the progress of Christianity.

One ground of pulpit failure, we think, is the absence of *directness of aim*,—arising from the want of a duly practical consideration, on the part of Ministers, of the *end for which they are put into the Ministry*. The attributes which distinguish the Gospel show, that the end of its publication is spiritual,—that it is to instruct men in their relation to the Supreme Being, and to persuade them to act according to that relation; or, to use the language of Scripture, to lead them to "repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ;" "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Christ." This end involves the deathless interests of mankind, and no higher end can possibly be proposed. An Apostle speaks of Ministers being "the savour of life unto life, or of

death unto death." The thorough conviction of such being the issues of the Christian Ministry would be amazingly influential: it would lead them to present such matter, adopt such a style, and use such earnestness, as manifestly to declare them to be men of ONE GREAT BUSINESS. It would be the impelling force of their whole conduct, which no obstacles could withstand, and no opposition overpower; their energy would be as resistless as the rushing wind, as intense as fire in its sevenfold heat.

Another reason why the pulpit is so comparatively inefficient, is the lack of that *evangelical truth* which is essential to all successful preaching. Biblical criticism, or ancient manners and customs, or natural theology, or the evidence furnished by science of the truth of religion, ought not to be the main subjects of pulpit discourses. We would not altogether exclude them; but THE GOSPEL, in its peculiar and distinctive character, should be the subject-matter. The apostolic example claims close and rigid imitation: "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord."

Professor Vinet expresses his mind on this subject with great clearness and beauty: his thoughts are precious gems:—

"The pulpit has not been erected in order that every thing may be there treated in a Christian manner: it has a special object, which is to introduce the Christian idea into life. It draws from the mine the precious metal of which each of us will make vessels or instruments for his own particular use. It is properly Christianity which it teaches, in its principles, and in its general applications. Christianity is first in order; Christianity is the object; the rest is only example, explanation, &c.

"I should say, then, Every thing that does not conduce directly to edification (to form Christ in us); every thing which an ordinary hearer cannot of himself convert into the bread of life; or, at least, every subject which you, Preacher, acknowledge to be such,—you ought not to make a subject of your preaching.

"You will exclude, then, every subject which has for its object some interest of this world. You will not even present religion under this aspect, except so far as it is necessary to exhibit the goodness of God, and the truth of religion itself. You will never consent to sell the Christian pulpit to the interests of the life that is passing away."  
—Pp. 53, 54.

The "Gospel of Christ" is the divinely-appointed instrument for the conversion of men, and their preparation for a higher state of existence. Any failure of a full and clear exhibition of this "Gospel" will, in equal ratio, cause a failure in the lofty ends of the Christian Ministry. All pulpits are somewhat defective in this particular. Indeed, we fear, there is a growing desire to preach sermons which shall consist of little prettinesses, rather than solid truth; or of civil rights, rather than Gospel freedom. What would be thought of a Protestant Minister in a large town

declaring from his pulpit, that at these times it was not necessary to insist on the doctrine of justification by faith, but rather to lift up the voice against priestly despotism? And yet such is the fact. If this is to be the matter of pulpit ministrations, the world would be no loser were our churches and chapels converted into Halls of Science, and our pulpits into *rostra* for the delivery of lectures on literature, on ethics, on philosophy, on political economy, and one knows not what else. It would be a dark and woful day for Britain, were her pulpits to lose their evangelical character. Priestly despotism, or infidel tyranny, would, despite of all our loud remonstrances, reign in fearful ascendancy. The duty enjoined on Timothy is the duty of Ministers in every age,—“PREACH THE WORD.” And on the clear, full, pointed, and earnest enunciation of this, will their success mainly depend. The Gospel is the best guardian of our civil freedom, as it is the only charter of our religious privileges and blessings.

The style, or language, of the pulpit is often another, and very serious, hinderance to the success of the Gospel. If our pulpits in former days were disfigured by scraps of Greek and Latin, they had the redeeming quality of an immense amount of evangelical truth, clothed in language easy to be understood, and with a point and simplicity of aim that failed not of being impressive. Whereas, in these days, though learned phrases are happily excluded from the pulpits, there is often miserable poverty of thought, arrayed in language either vapid or bombastic, attenuated to an unconscionable degree, or groaning under the weight of figures and illustrations, that are sometimes as false as they are vulgar, and as unmeaning as they are ridiculously gaudy.

The first requisite in language is perspicuity; and “by perspicuity,” as Quintilian observes, “care is to be taken, not that the hearer *may* understand, if he will; but that he *must* understand, whether he will or not.”\* On this topic we cannot refrain from giving an extract from an admirable living writer: †—

“The appropriateness of any composition, whether written or spoken, is easily deduced from its object. If the object be to instruct, convince, or persuade, or all these at the same time, we naturally expect that it should be throughout of a direct and earnest character; indicating a mind absorbed in the avowed object, and solicitous only about what may subserve it. We expect that this singleness of purpose should be seen in the topics discussed, in the arguments selected to enforce them, in the modes of illustration, and even in the peculiarities of style and expression. We expect that nothing shall be introduced merely for the purpose of inspiring an interest, either in the thoughts

\* “*Non ut intelligere possit, sed ne omnino possit non intelligere curandum.*”—*Instit.*, lib. viii., cap. 2.

† H. Rogers.



or in the language, apart from their pertinency to the object; or of exciting an emotion of delight for its own sake, as in poetry; although it is quite true that the most vivid pleasure will necessarily result from perceiving an exact adaptation of the means to the end. We cannot readily pardon mere beauties or elegancies, striking thoughts, or graceful imagery, if they are marked by this irrelevancy; since they serve only to impede the vehement current of argument or feeling. In a word, we expect nothing but what, under the circumstances of the speaker, is prompted by *nature*,—nature, not as opposed to a deliberate effort to adapt the means to the ends, and to do what is to be done as well as possible; for this, though in one sense art, is also the truest nature,—but nature, as opposed to whatever is inconsistent with the idea that the man is under the dominion of genuine feeling, and bent upon taking the directest path to the accomplishment of his object.

"True eloquence is not like some painted window, which both transmits the light of day variegated and tinged with a thousand hues, and diverts the attention from its proper use to the pomp and splendour of the artist's doings. It is a perfectly transparent medium, transmitting light, without suggesting a thought about the medium itself. Adaptation to the one single object is every thing.

"These maxims have been universally recognised in deliberative and forensic eloquence. Those who have most severely exemplified them, have ever been regarded as the truest models; while those who have partially violated them, though still considered in a qualified sense very eloquent, have failed to obtain the highest place. Nor, it may be safely said, would the irrelevant discussions, the florid declamation, the imaginative finery, the tawdry ornament, which too often disgrace the Pulpit,—which too often are heard in it, not only without astonishment, but with admiration,—be tolerated for a moment in the Senate, or at the Bar.

"We have long felt convinced that the eloquence of the Pulpit in its general character has never been assimilated, so far as it might have been, and ought to have been, to that which has produced the greatest effect elsewhere; and which is shown to be of the right kind, both by the success which has attended it, and by the analysis of the qualities by which it has been distinguished. If we were compelled to give a brief definition of the principal characteristics of this truest style of eloquence, we should say it was 'practical reasoning, animated by strong emotion;' or, if we might be indulged in what is rather a description than a definition of it, we should say that it consisted in reasoning on topics calculated to inspire a common interest, expressed in the language of ordinary life, and in that brief, rapid, familiar style, which natural emotion ever assumes. The former half of this description would condemn no small portion of the compositions called 'Sermons,' and the latter half a still larger portion."

In looking at the Sermons and Discourses which now issue from the press, as what have been previously delivered from the pulpits, one is grieved to find, generally, the absence of a clear, vigorous, and thoroughly English style. Dr. Cumming, who has acquired an extensive popularity, and whose pulpit utterances

are published through the press almost as rapidly as they are published from the pulpit, is not free from censure. His style is loose, careless, and repeatedly spoiled by incorrect figures and similes. Perhaps one cause of his failure is the rapidity with which he publishes. It would be of immense advantage—if not to his exchequer, certainly to his literary reputation—if he wrote less and thought more; if he took the same time to write one thoroughly good book, which he has hitherto deemed sufficient for the writing of half-a-dozen inferior ones. He has the ability, and can, if he will, use it to admirable purpose, both for his own honour, and the benefit of mankind. Dr. James Hamilton, of London, is not free from faults of style. His sterling religious character, his loving spirit, and the popularity he has acquired, make his writings to be not only admired, but imitated; and imitated, not in their beauties, but in their defects. Possessing an imagination richly luxuriant, he sometimes suffers that luxuriance to run positively wild. His figures of speech, being often drawn from the peculiarities of science, surround his thoughts as with a Scotch mist, rather than exhibit them as under a bright southern sky. Figurative language, whilst it is partly to please, is chiefly to make thought more luminous and impressive; and in this Dr. Hamilton repeatedly fails.

*"Sermo est imago cogitationis."* Language, being "the image of thought," should be transparent as crystal, easy to be understood, of forcible construction, and fitted directly to convey the thought to the mind. So far as it wants these characteristics, it is essentially defective.\* It would seem as if some Preachers tried how far they could indulge the bombastic and ridiculous in style: they barbarously do to their intellects, what the wild Indians do to their bodies,—daub them with gay and fantastic colours. Wearisome would be the task, to note the instances of false and extravagant figures and illustrations, which form the staple of many of the sermons of the present day. Not long

\* "Besides the ordinary rules of perspicuity, in respect of diction, which, in common with every other public speaker, he ought to attend to, he must advert to this in particular,—that the terms and phrases he employs in his discourse be not beyond the reach of the inferior ranks of people. Otherwise his preaching is, to the bulk of his audience, but beating the air; whatever the discourse may be in itself, the speaker is to them no better than 'as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.' It is reported of Archbishop Tillotson, that he was wont, before preaching his sermons, to read them privately to an illiterate old woman of plain sense, who lived in the house with him; and wherever he found he had employed any word or expression which she did not understand, he instantly erased it, and substituted a plainer in its place, till he brought the style down to her level. The story is much to the Prelate's honour; for, however incompetent such judges might be of the composition, the doctrine, or the argument, they are certainly the most competent judges of what terms and phrases fall within the comprehension of the vulgar, the class to which they belong. But though such an expedient would not answer in every situation, we ought, at least, to supply the want of it by making it more an object of attention than is commonly done, to discover what, in point of language, falls within, and what without, the sphere of the common people."—*Dr. Campbell's "Pulpit Eloquence."*

ago, we heard a preacher, amid a host of fine sayings, state that "the twelfth chapter of Romans rose up in the New Testament like the tree of knowledge of good and evil." And we know another who (*reverenter scribatur*) spoke of "the Holy Ghost putting his hand down the moral spine of a child's back."

For the benefit of the junior Clergy of all denominations, we will select an extract from South, who (always excepting his vituperation and unseemly witticisms) is about the best model of pulpit style our nation has produced. The truth embodied in the following passages is not less valuable because the author did not always himself remember it, but came frequently within the reach of his own satire; for the extravagance of wit is quite as blameable as that of fancy:—

"Nothing in nature can be imagined more absurd, irrational, and contrary to the very design and end of speaking, than an obscure discourse; for in that case the Preacher may as well leave his *tongue*, and the auditors their *ears*, behind them; as neither he communicates, nor they understand, any more of his mind and meaning, after he has spoken to them, than they did before. And yet, as ridiculous as such fustian bombast from the pulpit is, none are so transported and pleased with it, as those who least understand it. For still the greatest admirers of it are the grossest, the most ignorant and illiterate people, who, of all men, are the fondest of high-flown metaphors and allegories."

Speaking of the style of the Apostles, he further adds, that "it was easy, obvious, and familiar; with nothing in it strained or far-fetched; no affected scheme, or airy fancies, above the reach or relish of an ordinary apprehension: no, nothing of all this; but their grand subject was truth, and, consequently, above all those petty arts and poor additions; as not being capable of any greater lustre or advantage than to appear just as it is. For there is a certain majesty in plainness; as the proclamation of a Prince never frisks it in tropes or fine conceits, in numerous and well-turned periods, but *commands* in sober, natural expressions. A substantial beauty, as it comes out of the hands of nature, needs neither paint nor patch; things never made to adorn, but to cover something that would be hid. To adorn and clothe them is to cover them, and that to obscure them. The eternal salvation and damnation of souls are not things to be treated of with jests and witticisms. And he who thinks to furnish himself out of plays and romances with language for the pulpit, shows himself much fitter to act a part in the revels, than for the cure of souls.

"'I speak the words of soberness,' said St. Paul. And I preach the Gospel 'not with the enticing words of man's wisdom.' This was the way of the Apostle's discoursing of things sacred. Nothing here of the *fringes of the north star*;

nothing of nature's becoming unnatural; nothing of the down of angels' wings, or the beautiful locks of cherubims; no starched similitudes, introduced with a '*Thus have I seen a cloud rolling in its airy mansion,*' and the like. No; these were sublimities above the rise of the apostolic spirit. For the Apostles, poor mortals! were content to take lower steps, and to tell the world in plain terms, '*that he who believed should be saved, and that he who believed not should be damned.*' And this was the dialect which pierced the conscience, and made the hearers cry out, '*Men and brethren, what shall we do?*' It tickled not the ear, but sank into the heart; and when men came from such sermons, they never commended the preacher for his taking voice or gesture; for the fineness of such a simile, or the quaintness of such a sentence: but they spoke like men conquered by the overpowering force and evidence of the most concerning truths: much in the words of the two disciples going to Emmaus: '*Did not our hearts burn within us, while he opened to us the Scriptures?*'"

But we need not go back to the days of South for an excellent description of the Gospel Preacher. The evangelical poet, Cowper, who has already depicted for us the pulpit in its authority and power, shall teach us how to recognise its proper occupant.

"Would I describe a Preacher, such as Paul,  
Were he on earth, would hear, approve, and own,  
Paul should himself direct me. I would trace  
His master-strokes, and draw from his design.  
I would express him simple, grave, sincere;  
In doctrine uncorrupt; in language plain,  
And plain in manner; decent, solemn, chaste,  
And natural in gesture; much impress'd  
Himself, as conscious of his awful charge,  
And anxious mainly that the flock he feeds  
May feel it too; affectionate in look,  
And tender in address, as well becomes  
A messenger of grace to guilty men.  
Behold the picture!—Is it like?—Like whom?"

We shall be excused for giving an extract from Vinet on the language of the Bible; indeed, our readers will thank us. The passage forcibly reminds us of the divine proverb: "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver."

"I shall not attempt, after Rollin, and especially after Fénelon, and after Maury, to speak of the eloquence and of the poetry of the Bible. I shall only observe, that what distinguishes it, and places it above all the master-pieces of literature, is, that its beauties are not literary; that the thought has every where given the form in such a manner, that the union of the form and of the thought was never so intimate. The beauty of the language of the Bible, therefore, has every where something substantial, which immediately fixes the mind upon that which lies at the very bottom of the subject-matter, without

permitting it to amuse itself in disguising it. We are struck before we have time to enjoy, or even to admire, it.

"It is also a remarkable thing, that this oriental language, so strange, at the first aspect, to the imaginations of the West, should be, at the same time, so human, and, by that very circumstance, so universal, that it should easily assimilate itself to all nations, to all forms of civilization, to all languages, much better than could be done by the language and literature of any age, and any people, much less remote from us. All in the sacred books that relates to man, all that paints man, is characterized by a depth and a simplicity, which nothing has ever equalled: the Bible, on these subjects, has spoken a universal language, has displayed a universal poetry; the Bible was framed, in this respect, as in every other, to be the Book of the human race. Setting aside every reason founded on authority, we could borrow from no other source images and traits more suitable to the subjects of which we treat in the pulpit, nor adorn religious discourse with beauties more becoming and more grave.

"All the kinds of beauty proper to the religious discourse abound in Holy Scripture, and our position, *face to face* with it, gives us the right, imposes upon us the duty, to appropriate to ourselves all these beauties. There are none but we who can do this; that which, every where else, would be plagiarism or affectation, is one of the highest kinds of suitableness, is the truth of that species of eloquence which we cultivate. Who would not wish,—but who would dare?—in the other kinds of oratory, to sow his discourse with so many lively allusions, to colour it with so many reflections? But the Bible is more than a source or a document; the Bible is almost our subject: we have to speak of it; our voice serves to echo it: it is like a forest which we fell, like a field which we reap; this labour is less an addition to our task than it is our task itself; it is therefore, boldly and frankly, that we may draw from this treasure. And what a treasure! This book reaches the sublime of all subjects. The most finished types of the grand and of the pathetic, of the human and of the religious, of the strong and of the tender, are there as in a repository. Among all the books which expressed ideas of the same order, if one were free to choose, if their authority were equal, it is to this that we would always return. The names which it has given to all the things of God and of man are definitive, are irrevocable. What it has expressed in one manner, cannot be expressed in any other manner without being enfeebled. Whole nations have possessed themselves of this language, and have blended it with their own; the Bible has given to human speech a multitude of expressions, as it has given to human thought some of its consecrated forms. In repeating to men the sayings of the Bible, we recall to them family traditions."—Pp. 383-385.

Another most important reason why the Gospel is not more efficient, is the want of more solemn and earnest trust in the Supreme Being, to accompany the ministration of it with his own divine influence. However much the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's agency in the progress of the Gospel is under-rated in the present day; and however much taste, and education, and propitious circumstances, may be now advocated as the regenerators of the



human species, we must emphatically maintain, not only that the Gospel is the only remedy, but that the real ends of the Gospel institute can never be attained except by the accompanying energy of the Eternal Spirit. Even the truth itself, though presented with all possible clearness, and arrayed in all the charms of the most finished eloquence, and expressed in language the most pointed and vigorous, cannot succeed in the conversion of mankind. As an instrument, the truth is, indeed, adapted with exquisite fitness; but God the Holy Ghost is the Sovereign Agent who alone can wield it with effect. The spiritual and moral achievements which the Bible proposes, are accomplished, not by the wisdom of men, but by the power of God. What, then, is more obvious than that it is the duty of Ministers, in all their efforts for the spreading of scriptural truth by the sowing of the incorruptible seed which is the word of God, to depend entirely on Jehovah to give the increase?

The last reason we shall name, is a deficiency of that deep personal piety which should be possessed and exemplified by Christian Ministers. The Christian Ministry is not a learned profession, but a divine vocation,—a vocation that requires those who engage in it to be partakers of the life and power of that Gospel which they preach to others. Were it needful, overwhelming evidence might be produced from Scripture, that wickedness disqualifies for this office, and that the highest Christian purity is demanded. The primitive Church had a lively sense of the indispensable necessity of personal holiness before men could be separated to this sacred calling. The character of Barnabas is what should be always exemplified by Christian Ministers: "He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith."

Dr. Hannah, in his excellent "Letter to a Junior Preacher," makes impressive reference to this point:—

"Remember that the Christian system is concerned with the heart of man; and that, while it instructs his mind, it especially seeks to restore him to the favour, the image, and the communion of his God. If it is compared to light, it is the light of the sun, which shines by its unrivalled splendour; but which, at the same time, penetrates, warms, animates,—kindles all into life, and crowns all with joy. Assure yourself, then, that an improvement in personal piety ought to be associated, nay, identified, with your progress in theological studies. Never think it enough to say, that you have read many books, solved many difficult problems in divinity, and acquired many new and rare sentiments. All this may be true. But allow me to ask, with all the affectionate solicitude which I would use towards an own friend or brother, Have you also gained a larger measure of the meek, holy, loving spirit of Jesus, your great Teacher? Have you 'grown in the grace,' as well as 'in the knowledge,'—and, indeed, as the means of your growing in the knowledge,—'of our Lord and Saviour?' If you have not, 'be not deceived.' You have miserably failed in the

attainment of your object. Boast not of your skill in theology: it is a perfect illusion. Too much light you cannot receive; but O! let it be the light of life."—Pp. 65, 66.

These are weighty sentiments, and cannot be too carefully pondered.

The reasons of pulpit failure above assigned, we regard as the most important. Some may be disposed to attribute that *failure* to the want of what they consider a more perfect form of Church government. From these we decidedly differ. Christianity is not advanced by mere ecclesiastical economics; they may exist never so completely, and yet fail in producing one instance of the sublime end for which Christianity is made known. The form is comparatively nothing; the vital religious power is the great *desideratum*. Were Ministers universally to possess the mind, and imitate the example, of their Divine Master; were they to preach the *truth as it is in Jesus*, and nothing but the truth; were they to commend that truth to the consciences of men in language, simple, terse, and transparent; were they, in all their ministrations, to look away from themselves, and rely, with implicit confidence, on the promised aid of the Holy Spirit; they would then find how God, as in apostolic times, "would cause them to triumph in Christ, and make manifest the savour of his knowledge by them in every place;"—converts would appear, numerous as the drops of dew from the womb of the morning, and arrayed in the beauties of holiness.

- ART. III.—1. *Histoire des Ducs d'Orleans.* Par M. LAURENTIE. Quatre Tomes. 8vo. Paris. 1850.  
 2. *Histoire de la Vie Politique et Privée de Louis Philippe.* Par A. DUMAS. Deux Tomes. 8vo. Paris. 1854.  
 3. *The History of the House of Orleans.* By W. COOKE TAYLOR, LL.D. Three Vols. 8vo. London: Bentley. 1853.

THAT the Duke of Orleans, for the time being, was always a pretender to the throne, and the enemy of its occupant, appears ever to have been considered an incontrovertible fact. It is one that can hardly be disputed; and the antagonism between Orleans and the sceptre commenced with the first little Prince on the roll of these royal Dukes.

The young gentleman in question was the second son of Philip VI. (de Valois). He was born at Vincennes, in 1336; and the good city whose name was borrowed, in order to furnish him with a ducal title, fell, or rose, into a state of delightful enthusiasm at the honour. It was to this Prince that Humbert, Dauphin of Vienne, made gift of his territory; but the father of Philip of Orleans compelled him to resign gift and title, which

were transferred to his elder brother John. From that period the heir to the French throne was called "the Dauphin;" and it is historically clear that the Dukes of Orleans not only desired to recover the title, but the inheritance.

The career of the first Duke, Philip, was not very long, nor yet particularly brilliant. He was a good soldier and a sorry Christian. At Poitiers, when scarcely twenty years of age, he led six-and-thirty banners and a couple of hundred pennons into the field. When he had brought his followers within sight of the English ranks, he remarked, "Now, Sirs, you talked right valiantly at your hearths of how you would eat these pestilent English knaves, if you could but get your hands upon their throats. There they are before you! Charge! and may St. Denis give you power both to eat and to digest!" But the broad-cloth arrows and the spears of England were too much for even the eager followers of Orleans. Few of them got back to the hearths around which they had so lately boasted.

Duke Philip led a gay life in England during the period he remained here as hostage for his brother, the King, John, who had been allowed to return to France to raise a ransom. He had been married, when only in his ninth year, to Blanche, daughter of Charles the Fair; and his profligacy was of a quality to break the heart of sterner wives than gentle Blanche. He survived till the reign of Charles V., the son of John, who cut down his appanages, and had much to do in guarding against his uncle's designs in return. But the King had not to keep guard long; for Philip of Orleans, worn out with his excesses, died in 1375, in the thirty-ninth year of his age, and was buried with as much pomp, in the church of the Celestines in Paris, as though there were men who had honoured him when living, or who mourned at his departure.

Philip died childless. Charles V., his elder brother, had two sons; one named after himself; the second, Louis Count de Valois, who ultimately had conferred on him the title, by which he became the second Duke of Orleans. He was a marvellous boy; and the first words he uttered were, "*Ave, Maria!*" It is seriously averred that, at the age of eleven years, he bore himself as bravely on the bloody field of Rosbecque as any veteran soldier there. He was, indeed, precocious in most things, and began to whisper in ladies' ears, when preceptors should have been pulling his own. He was fair of face, graceful of figure, sweet of voice, seductive of speech, and easy of principle. He loved money and hated morality; a double fact which he illustrated by receiving under his protection Pierre de Craon, who came to him laden with the gold of which that unfaithful servant had plundered his master, Louis of Anjou. He was, in truth, a young monster of iniquity and avarice. He married the superb Valentine, daughter of Galeas Visconti, Duke of

Milan; but he basely outraged this lady, as he did nature itself, when he seduced from her duty the wife of his own brother, Isabella of Bavaria. He could not gain the crown; but he could dishonour and destroy the Queen, nothing loth to encounter him half way in guilt. The Duke and his royal brother held a passage-of-arms at St. Denis, at which the orgies would have made even the Babylonians of Quintus Curtius blush. Valour induced friends to hack at one another gallantly in the lists by day; and the general licence of the night made of the banquet a scene, at sight of which not only might the angels have wept, but demons have shuddered. Louis was leader in the fray; for it was more of fray than feast, where drink maddened the vicious, and the vicious acknowledged no restraint. At banquet or in battle, however, the thoughts of Louis were with his sister-in-law, Isabella. He had neither respect nor love for his consort, Valentine, and their two sons. He was, on one occasion, in Languedoc with his brother Charles, when he proposed that they should try their skill in horsemanship by galloping back to Paris. The trial was accepted; but Louis arrived in the capital long before his King and brother; and Isabella too warmly welcomed him who first arrived. Valentine, perhaps, would not have learned her husband's guilt, but for that very Pierre de Craon whom Louis had encouraged in crime, by the commission of which he pecuniarily profited; and he was now betrayed by the criminal, whom he would not further serve, because from that criminal there was nothing more to be gained.

But Louis of Orleans had contrived to secure much of the ill-gotten wealth of De Craon; and, with a portion thereof he erected an expiatory chapel, at the opening of which he walked barefooted to the altar, in testimony of his sorrow at the fatal issue of one of the roughest of his jokes. At a grand marriage-festival, given in honour of the nuptials of one of the ladies of Queen Isabella, Louis introduced an *entrée masquée*, consisting of six individuals chained together as satyrs. One of these was the King; and the whole half-dozen were attired in dresses of a highly inflammable nature. The deportment of these satyrs was "beastly;" nay, it is almost an injustice to "beasts" to say so. Heaven and human nature were alike outraged on this occasion. The debauchery and drunken revelry of the satyrs were at the highest, when Louis of Orleans, thoughtlessly,—and yet some say, maliciously,—thrusting a lighted torch at the King's dress, set it on fire; and, in an instant, the chained six were struggling in a mass of flames, howling, cursing, and helpless. The King was rescued; but two Knights died of their injuries: and it was that their souls might rest in peace, and that he himself might be reconciled with Heaven, that Louis built a chapel out of funds which he had forced from a man who had stolen them from his master. Louis laughed when all was done; but the angels must

have wept. This consequence, however, would have little affected the unscrupulous Duke, who was as unjust as he was grasping. He banished his wife, Valentine, to Neufchatel, on an accusation of her being too familiar with the now half-insane King; and from the royal semi-idiot he obtained a grant of all property forfeited by criminals. Mezeray might well say of him, "*Il profitait de tout.*" But he forced more from the King than this. He obtained the power of levying taxes, and the revenue arising therefrom he placed in his own coffers; thus robbing the people, and cheating the King. When murmurs arose at the impost, his answer was, that it was levied, not on his sole authority, but with the consent of the other administrators of the kingdom,—his kinsmen, the Dukes of Burgundy and Berri. The wrathful denial of the two Dukes compelled Louis of Orleans to abolish the tax; and thereupon he unblushingly intimated to the people, that they were relieved of the impost solely in consequence of his own remonstrance with the King! That poor King! He never woke to transient reason without beholding the precipice down which Louis was driving the chariot of the State; Isabella at his side; and fierce Burgundy loading the air with imprecations, not at the wickedness of Orleans, but that he himself could not share in the Government and the profits. And these profits were enormous: that they were tempting to unscrupulous cupidity, may be seen in the fact that, on one occasion, when the royal officers deposited the taxes in the Treasury, and defended the deposit, Louis headed an armed force, attacked the Treasury, defeated its faithful defenders, and triumphantly carried off the "resources of the kingdom." He was, moreover, a remover of landmarks; acre to acre he added to his estates; and, like the Nobleman in Hamlet, he was "spacious in the possession of dirt."

His name was a familiar one in England at the period of which we are treating; for it was by his especial aid that Henry of Lancaster dethroned the gentle Richard. Monstrelet cites the legal deed by which Henry of Lancaster and Louis of Orleans entered into bonds of sworn brotherhood; but this line of fraternity did not restrain the French Duke from summoning the usurper King to mortal combat, on the ground that the latter was the assassin of his liege lord. Henry denied the imputation, refused the challenge, and dismissed the bearer of it with the deed of brotherhood, which he contemptuously returned to his capricious *quasi*-kinsman.

Louis was the father of Dunois, the famous "*Bâtard d'Orleans.*" The mother of Dunois was a married lady, Mariette d'Enghien; and history has no such horrible story, nor romance any such revolting legend, as that which tells of the fiendish brutality of the sire of Dunois. The very soul sickens at the thought of the revolting treatment to which the noble Mariette was subjected.



But fiend as was the perpetrator, he could, like the devils spoken of by the Apostle, "*tremble*." His courage was not perfect, even when he became Lieutenant-General of the kingdom, with the Pope to sanction all he did. The most truculent of Roman Emperors used to hide himself beneath his bed when thunder hurtled in the air; and Louis, once overtaken by a sudden storm on his way from chapel, where he had heard a comminatory sermon, was so alarmed that he called his creditors together, in order that he might satisfy their demands, and so, in one sense, obey the apostolic injunction, which says, "Owe no man any thing." But when the ecstatic creditors were assembled at the ducal palace, the storm had passed away, and the sermon was forgotten; and therewith the creditors were violently driven from the mansion, with pouches and purses as ungarnished as when they had entered. Avarice was, perhaps, his besetting sin; and he even offered to resign his high office of Lieutenant-General, provided he might have, in its place, the irresponsible administration of the national finances. He negotiated the marriage subsequently concluded between his son Charles and Isabella, the widow of our own royal Richard, with a sharpness of view towards the settlements, which proves that the Orleans of the House of Valois were not of a less mercantile spirit, even in affairs of the heart, than the Orleans of Bourbon, who transacted the famous marriage which united the illegitimate and the legitimate branches of the house, in the persons of Mlle. de Penthièvre and the Duke de Chartres (Philippe Egalité).

The fiercest adversary of Louis was that redoubtable Duke of Burgundy, who is known in history as "John the Fearless." These foes, however, were reconciled by mutual friends; and to show how earnest they were, they proceeded, hand-in-hand, to church, knelt at the altar, received the sacrament, and, with what they took for "very God" in their mouths, swore that thenceforward they would be only as loving brothers. In further token of their reconciliation they, for several nights, shared the same couch,—a knightly ceremony much followed by men in their respective positions. Shortly after, Orleans conducted Burgundy into his gallery of portraits. It was a gallery like that which some of our readers may have seen at Munich, during the late King's reign, wherein hung the counterfeit presentments of all those ladies whose beauty had excited the admiration of the owner of the gallery. Jean Sans-Peur is said to have recognised among them a portrait which marvellously reminded him of his own consort; but he passed on, and said nothing. He meditated so much the more deeply; and such terrible threatenings seemed to sit upon his brow, that the Duke de Berri, suspecting at whom they pointed, made both his kinsmen attend him to the altar, where they once more took the sacrament, and vowed eternal friendship. It was not many nights after, that

Orleans was on his way, mounted on a mule, and accompanied by a feeble escort of his followers, returning from a guilty visit to the Queen Isabella, at her residence, the Hotel Barbette. He had suddenly arisen from supper with the Queen, on feigned intimation conveyed to him by a conspirator,—who assumed, for the nonce, the office of a King's messenger,—that His Majesty required the Duke's presence at the Hotel de Saint Pol. He went forth, mounted as we have said, three footmen carrying torches before him. Eighteen armed men awaited him in the old Rue de Temple. They fell upon their victim just as he had reached the front of the house called "*L'Image de Notre Dame.*" All his followers fled, save one, who met death with his worthless master. The assassins assailed the Duke with cries of "*Death! Death!*" Orleans, conceiving some mistake, exclaimed, "What means this violence? Know ye not I am the Duke of Orleans?" "All the better!" was the fatal rejoinder; "it is you whom we have been waiting for!" Orleans pulled up his bridle, but a blow from a battle-axe cut off the hand which held the rein, at the wrist. Daggers pierced his sides, and swords his throat; and at length, as he fell from the mule, a blow from a club dashed out his brains, and he lay dead in the middle of the street. At this moment a man issued from the house, "*L'Image de Notre Dame;*" his features were concealed by a hood of scarlet cloth, trimmed with gold. It was Burgundy himself. He bore a club; and as another of the murderers held a torch over the fallen body, Burgundy dealt the latter a heavy blow with his club, and added, "He is dead! Put out your lights, and disperse!" The order was not prematurely given; the street was filling with people, and the assassins, in passing through the house, set fire to it, in order to attract that way the public attention. They got clear off; and on the following day, when the body of the murdered Orleans was exposed in the church of the Blancs Manteaux, there was no one there who seemed so profoundly sorrowful at the fact, and indignant against the perpetrators, as the hypocritical Burgundy, who touched the corpse, in company with all present, as a token of being innocent of all participation. The attention of the police, however, was inconveniently directed towards the palace of the Duke of Burgundy, whither one of the assassins, in a scarlet hood, had been seen to fly for refuge. John was no longer what his name declared him,—"*the Fearless.*" He sent for his kinsman Berri, made hurried avowal of, and apology for, his crime, and then set foot in stirrup, nor ever pulled rein, till he was beyond the power of France, in his own sovereign dukedom. He was of course a pious man, was this Burgundian Duke, according to the spirit of the times,—and, indeed, of very recent times also. It is not many years ago that we were discussing this murder upon the very stage where it had been enacted; and our then youthful indignation found

expression in some stringent terms. "Burgundy had his virtues, nevertheless," was the remark of one at our side. "Ay, marry, and how did the villain manifest them?" "Nay, Sir," was the calm rejoinder, "call him not 'villain;' for, in pious thanksgiving for his escape, he ordered the *Angelus* to be rung for ever at one o'clock in the afternoon, in memory of the hour at which he crossed the frontier into his ducal territory, on the last day of November, 1407." We looked inquiringly at the speaker, but we saw nothing on his brow, save sincerity and error.

The conduct of the wife of Orleans exhibits another curious trait of the times. She was the mother of three sons, Charles, Philip, and John. But she did not look to them in her great sorrow. She sent for Dunois, that natural son of her husband, and who returned little of the strange affection which she showed for him. He was then very young, but she looked upon him as missioned to punish her husband's murderer. She loved him as her own, and reared him as tenderly as though he had been heir to a Crown. Whenever she saw him full of soul and ardour, the tears would well to her eyes, and she would remark, that she had been wronged of him, that he ought to have been hers, and that none of her children were so well qualified to take revenge upon the assassin of their sire, as this, the illegitimate John,—who was afterwards so renowned under his more familiar appellation of Dunois.

Full as strongly did the wronged Valentine continue to mourn. She assumed for her device a watering-pot,—of course, pouring forth salt tears. On the mouth-piece of the "rose" was engraven a coil of *S's* which some ingenious interpreter declared to signify, "*Solam Sepe Seipsam Sollicitari Suspirareque.*" She chose, for a legend beneath, the expressive phrase: "*Nil mihi præterea, præterea nil mihi.*" But stranger still was the settlement of this great feud. Burgundy returned to Paris upon safe-warrant. Before the whole Court, and in presence therewith of the entire family of Orleans, he made *amende* for his deed. He confessed the murder, and justified it, pronouncing the late Duke to have been a traitor, to rid the King of whom, was to do the Monarch justice. And thereupon that Monarch meekly expressed his obligations to the murderer of his brother; the family of the victim (after a show of decent reluctance) declared themselves satisfied; and, to let the tragedy be followed by a dramatic act of gaiety, the assassin espoused a Princess of the family, the Church blessed the entire arrangements, and all was thenceforth to go as merrily as a marriage-bell.

The third Duke of Orleans was Charles, son of the second Duke. He was of so poor merit that even the party which cared for his interests (and its own) took its name, not from their leader, but from the Count d'Armagnac, father of Bona, the second wife of Duke Charles. Between the Armagnacs and

the Burgundians, France was reduced to the most fearful condition of misery. The object of the former was, to avenge and make pecuniary profit of the murder of the late Duke:—and that one murder led to a thousand others; and no one profited thereby, save Satan, who appears to have been the chief adviser of both parties.

At length, however, the arms of each were turned against one common foe,—the English. The great collision took place at Agincourt, and resulted in a triumph, the shouts of which still echo in the hearts of the descendants of the victors. The young Duke of Orleans was made captive on that terrible day, and was so overwhelmed at the dreadful calamity, that for two whole days he refused all nourishment. Appetite, however, then got the better of his grief, and his stomach proved stronger than his sorrow. Henry brought him prisoner to England, where he resided during more than a quarter of a century. During this long time, he was occupied in writing poetry, bewailing his detention from La Belle France, kissing with expansive demonstration of affection the French Ambassador from the Duke of Burgundy in England, and tempting Henry to set him at liberty without ransom, in return for certain treachery, which he offered to commit against his own Sovereign, Charles VII., whom he engaged to renounce,—acknowledging Henry in his place. At length his release was effected, and that by Burgundian aid. Philip, son of John the Fearless, slain on the bridge at Montreau, paid down 300,000 crowns, the city of Orleans contributed some 9,000 gold francs, and therewith the captive Duke had permission to return to France, where he married a niece of his ransomer, Philip; thus once more, by gold and a wedding, patching-up a peace between two houses to whom it was second nature to be at war.

There were few things illustrative of character or scene that escaped the observation or memory of Shakspeare. The echo at the foot of Macbeth's Castle still does justice to the remark of the usurping King to the Doctor,—

"I would applaud them to the very echo,  
That should applaud again."

In Shakspeare's "Henry V.," the Duke of Orleans has little to do, and less to say; but the latter is perfectly characteristic of the Prince in question. The poetical knowledge of the royal poet is illustrated in the remark made by him when the Dauphin states that he had written a sonnet in praise of his palfrey, which began thus, "*Wonder of nature.*" "I have heard," says Orleans, "a sonnet begin so to one's mistress." Of all the French Lords, he is the only one who is made to deliver a common truth in fancy phrase, "The sun doth gild our armour; up, my Lords!" And when others despair, he alone, as was the case, entertains hope, and cheerfully exclaims:—

"We are enough yet living in the field,  
To smother up the English in our throngs,  
If any order might be thought upon."

When Charles of Orleans returned to France, the last visit he paid was one to the King. He resided for some time in retirement at Orleans and Blois. The French Monarch, however, behaved with noble generosity towards him, received him cordially, when the Duke experienced an attack of loyalty, and gave him 160,000 francs, wherewith to purchase the freedom of his brother, the Count of Angoulême, then detained as a hostage in England. Various opinions have been given with respect to the conduct of Duke Charles in this country during his captivity; but the pages of Rymer show, that, much as he was given to poetry, he could dabble a little in treason; and that, in *his* estimation, it was perfectly right, that self should take precedence of country, and the general good yield to that of the individual,—in other words, of himself. In France, as he grew in years, he became more and more devoted to agricultural pursuits; but, like Philippe Egalité at Villers-Cotterets, while he watched the growth of cabbages, he was vigilant as to what he thought his rights. Thence his expedition against Milan, to the ducal Crown of which he laid claim, an immediate male heir to the late Duke being wanting, through his mother. But the lance of Orleans was shivered by the sword of Sforza; and when the former heard of the utter failure of his expeditionary force, he left the quarrel to be bloodily contested, as it was, by more than one succeeding heir. In the mean time, Louis XI. had ascended the throne which his father Charles had left vacant, and the King of France and the Duke of Orleans were good friends,—when they were not antagonists. The Duke is said, indeed, to have become so mere a courtier in his advanced age, that, Louis, on one occasion, speaking to him in terms of strong reproach, he took it so to heart, that he crawled to Amboise, like a stricken deer to the covert, and there died despairingly, in the seventy-fourth year of his age.

He has always had a reputation for piety; but as this is chiefly based upon the fact, that every Friday he entertained thirteen poor people at dinner, waiting on them himself, and that annually, on Ascension Thursday, he washed the feet (previously cleaned) of as many mendicants, Charles of Orleans has but few claims to occupy a chapter in Hagio-biography.

He was thrice married: first, to Isabella, the widow of our Richard the Second; afterwards, to Bonne d'Armagnac; and, thirdly, to Maria of Cleves, by whom he had that son Louis, who succeeded him as Duke of Orleans, and ultimately wore the French crown as Louis XII.

The most remarkable of these wives was the first, Isabella, daughter of Charles VI. of France. This Princess was married



to our Richard when the bride was scarcely nine years of age, and the bridegroom was about four times as much. Richard espoused her for the sake of the alliance with France; and he treated her paternally, petting her like a lamb, giving her sweetmeats, and telling her fairy tales. He was fond of the child, and she of him; and when he departed from Windsor, on the outbreak of the rebellion of Bolingbroke, he left a kiss upon her brow that was impressed with the deep melancholy of a father perhaps separating for ever from a favourite daughter. It was with the feverish partiality of a child that Isabella espoused his cause; and, after death descended upon him so terribly, and she was taken back to France, it was long before she would lay down the trappings of her woe, or allow her young heart to be consoled for the loss of her old protector. Questions of State again made of her a wife; and in 1406, when she was but in her thirteenth year, her hand was given to Charles of Orleans, then only eleven years of age. Three years afterwards she gave birth to a daughter, and at the same time yielded up her own life,—that brief life, the happier for its brevity.

The merits of Charles of Orleans, as a poet, were undoubtedly very great. He had little of the obscurity of the poets of his day, few of their conceits, and none of their over-strained compliments. His Muse was gentle in her song,—tender, as became one who sang in a long captivity in Pontefract Castle. The lines devoted to descriptions of nature seem, if one may say so, to breathe freshly upon the cheeks like May breezes. They remind us chiefly of Surrey, particularly of that noble poet's exquisite sonnet on Spring. Charles's muse grew joyous as he grew in years, when he penned noisy roundelays, and those famous *chansons à danser*, which gained from him the name of "*Caroles*,"—a name common now, even in English, to all lyrics resonant of joy and glad tidings. Charles left the bulk of his manuscripts behind him in this country. Some of them found their way to France, and are now in the chief public library in Paris; but enough remain in this country to give life and excitement to the whole Society of Antiquaries, who will doubtless be obliged to us for reminding them of the fact.

We add one sample of the royal troubadour's quality, translated by the practised pen of Mr. Carey. Of its original author, we will only add one more additional trait. After the battle of Agincourt, Henry took him and the other captive Princes, in his own ship, from Calais to Dover. The passage was one of the stormiest; and the warriors who had encountered the horrors of the battle-field without blenching, were as timid as sick girls at finding themselves the sport of the furious wind on the unstable main. Charles especially excited the mirth of the English King, by dolorously asserting that he had rather fight a dozen Agincourts over again, than endure for another hour such a pas-

sage by sea. But to our promised taste of his quality as a poet:—

“To make my lady’s obsequies,  
My love a minster wrought,  
And in the chantry service there  
Was sung by doleful thought.  
The tapers were of burning sighs,  
That life and odour gave;  
And grief, illuminéd by tears,  
Irradiated her grave;  
And round about, in quaintest guise,  
Was carved,—‘Within this tomb there lies  
The fairest thing to mortal eyes!’

“Above her lieth spread a tomb  
Of gold and sapphires blue:  
The gold doth show her blessedness,  
The sapphires mark her true.  
For blessedness and truth in her  
Were livelily portray’d,  
When gracious God, *with both his hands*,  
Her wondrous beauty made:  
She was, to speak without disguise,  
The fairest thing to mortal eyes.

“No more, no more! My heart doth faint,  
When I the life recall  
Of her who lived so free from taint,  
So virtuous deem’d by all;  
Who in herself was so complete,  
I think that she was ta’en,  
By God, to feed his paradise,  
And with his saints to reign.  
For well she doth become the skies,  
Whom, while on earth, each one did prize,  
The fairest thing to mortal eyes.”

We now come to the first Duke of Orleans who ascended the throne of France. Louis, son of Charles, was born at Blois, in 1462. He will doubtless be familiar to most of our readers, figuring so graphically as he does in the “*Quentin Durward*” of Sir Walter Scott. Louis XI. compelled him to marry his deformed and sterile daughter Joan, threatening him with death by drowning, if he refused. Anne de Beaujeu, the other daughter of the King, loved the graceful Orleans, who, in his turn, wooed a great many fair ladies generally, and Anne of Bretagne in particular. When Anne de Beaujeu became Regent for the youthful Charles VIII., the Duke of Orleans plunged into an active armed opposition, which ultimately made of him the prisoner of that Princess, who, stung by the *spretæ injuria formæ*, treated him with an atrocious severity, and kept him, during a portion

of his captivity, chained in an iron cage, like a wild beast. Her desire was to compel him to solicit her compassion, and to make offer of his love; but Orleans bore his dreadful fate courageously during five years, and then owed his liberation to the spontaneous act of the young King Charles. He had, in the mean time, made wise use of the hours of his adversity; and he stepped into freedom one of the most accomplished men of his day. The death of Charles VIII. left the throne open to him, its lawful possessor. He stood by the deceased Monarch with salt rheum upon his eye-lashes, and resolution at his heart. Whither this latter tended, may be seen in the fact, that Louis, now the Twelfth of the name, not only buried the late Monarch at his own expense, but married that Monarch's widow. The relict of the departed Sovereign was that Anne of Bretagne of whom we have already spoken. She and Louis had been lovers in their younger days; but they made but a very discordant pair in the maturer years of less passion, and more discretion. Their letters, indeed, have been cited to prove the contrary; and these *do* betray a most orthodox warmth of conjugal affection. But then these epistles are known to be from the hands of the Court poets, who, in their office of Secretary, took all their phraseology from an Italian vocabulary, and had a supreme contempt for veracity and common sense. To marry Anne, he repudiated the innocent Joan; and, on the death of his second wife, he looked towards the Court of our Henry VIII., and solicited from that Monarch the hand of his gentle sister, the peerless Mary Tudor.

Now, if Louis of Orleans was the husband of three wives, Mary of England was the lady of many lovers,—herself loving but one. She had been wooed by Albert of Austria, and Charles of Spain, and now by Louis of France; but her heart was with Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, who was the most successful of the lovers after all. Suffolk is said to have formed part of the escort which accompanied Mary across the Channel. Among her ladies was a Mistress Anne Boleyn, a vivacious girl, who lost her felicity in achieving greatness. St. Wulphran, to whom the last prayers of the wedding-party were addressed before going on board, ill repaid their pious zeal. After rolling about for many hours in the most tub-like of ships, Knights and ladies were flung ashore on a desolate part of the French coast, on which they pitched their tents, beneath whose sheltering canvas they smoothed their ruffled plumes, shook out their silks, and calmed their grievously tormented stomachs.

The "Pearl of England," as Mary was styled by her fond brother Henry VIII., set up her hasty but splendid "state" in a rude hut, which was turned, for the nonce, into a palace, whither the Boulognese flocked in crowds to admire the gorgeousness of her *trousseau* and general appointments. She was exquisite in her grace and accomplishments. "Madame Marie

d'Angleterre" won golden opinions from all who looked upon her. They were dazzled with the gems she wore, set by the artistic hands of "Master William Verner;" and if our readers are desirous to peruse the detailed inventory of all the wealth which accompanied the "Flower of England,"—a young blossom to be grafted on an old and withered stem,—they will find it in the business-like book of accounts of Andrew of Worcester.

Marie moved slowly on to Abbeville, where Louis impatiently waited the arrival of his young bride. His impatience got the better of his gout; and, swallowing some stimulating drugs to steady his nerves and strengthen his sinews, and under pretence of a hunting-match, he galloped through the gates of Abbeville, for the purpose of sooner beholding his bride. He was attended by a more glorious company:—a more brilliant had not passed beneath the archways of the ramparts since the morning on which Philip of Valois passed by the same outlet to meet the English army and an overthrow upon the bloody field of Cressy. When the procession of the bride, and that peerless lady on her palfrey, came in view, the shattered King felt something like young blood within his veins. He put spurs to his steed, charged close up to the side of the Princess, gazed into her face and radiant eyes, and then, clapping his feeble hands, he uttered his ordinary oath, invoking all the fiends in Tophet to seize him, if "Madame Marie" were not twice as beautiful as report had pronounced her to be. The royal pair rode on, side by side, in advance of the double escort; and if Suffolk looked upon them, he might have sung,—

*"Ah, qu'il soit Roi! Mais qu'il me porte envie;  
J'ai votre cœur,—je suis plus Roi que lui."*

The marriage, after a world of tedious ceremony, took place in the church of St. Wulphran, at Abbeville. An old "custom of the country" had well-nigh determined Louis to have his wedding solemnized in another city; but he was gained over by a speech of the Mayor, who said, "Sire, you may wed here without breaking our old ecclesiastical law, which no longer exists, and which used to forbid husbands to dwell in company with their wives during three whole days and nights after the celebration of their nuptials." The matrimonial crown was worn by Mary for only three brief months. The way of life of Louis during that period would have killed a stronger man. In January, 1515, his excesses shook him off from the tree of life,—fruit withered and rotten,—into the grave beneath.

To follow the fortunes of our English Mary for a moment further, we may state that, in another three months, she was the happy wife of the Duke of Suffolk. Of this union there survived but two daughters,—Eleanor and Frances. Frances espoused Grey, Marquis of Dorset, on whom was conferred the title of Duke of Suffolk; and the most celebrated and unhappy

of whose children was that Lady Jane Grey, whose descent from Mary Tudor brought her to a momentary enjoyment of a throne, and, finally, to the block. The dust of Mary lies beneath the altar of the old abbey church at Bury St. Edmund's; and summer tourists could not possibly make a more agreeable or a cheaper trip, than by steaming from the Thames to Ipswich, up the beautiful river Orwell, and thence proceeding to the picturesque city of the royal martyr of England's early days.

In the person of that King, who was once noble-minded enough to say that Louis XII. had no recollection of the enemies of the Duke of Orleans, was extinguished the first lineal branch of the Orleans of the Valois race. The new Monarch was Francis I. (of Angoulême), cousin of the late King, who conferred the ducal title, whose descent we are tracing, upon his second son, Henry, born in 1518. Henry was that precocious Prince who, at fifteen, kissed the slipper, and made himself the amorous slave, of Diana de Poitiers, for whom he built the regal bower of Fontainebleau. Henry, as King, would have been more inclined to grant toleration to the Huguenots, but for the persuasion of his orthodox concubine. We now arrive at a period, of which we have fully treated in a previous Number,—the period of the greatness of the Guises. We may, therefore, pass lightly over it in this place. Confining ourselves simply to the line of Orleans, it must suffice to state, that when Henry became the successor of his elder brother Francis, the title of Duke of Orleans fell to his younger brother Charles. The latter was famed for his fiery courage and girl-like beauty, his gay spirit and reckless career, which was cut short, at Boulogne, by a fever. The title was then conferred on Louis, the second son of Henry II. This little Duke departed from that and all other worldly greatness, at the early age of one year and nine months. Henry then conferred it upon his brother Charles, who was afterwards "damned to everlasting fame" as Charles IX., the murderer of his Protestant subjects. When this Sovereign came to the throne, he added the title of Orleans to that of Anjou, already worn by his brother Henry, some time King of Poland, and subsequently King of France, under the style and title of King Henry III.,—the slayer of the great Guise, and the slain of the Dominican Jacques Clement. Henry III., when King, conferred the duchy on his mother, Catherine de Medicis. That exemplary lady enjoyed the usufruct thereof during life; and the duchy then (1589) reverted to the Crown,—but without possessing a Duke, until after the wars of the League, and the period of the peaceful days of "Henri Quatre," the successor of Henry III. With the latter closed the line of Dukes of the second branch,—that of Angoulême-Valois. We now come to the third and last race,—the Dukes of Orleans of the House of Bourbon.



In the year 1697, a second son was born to Henri Quatre and Marie de Medicis. At the mature age of sixteen days old, he was created Duke of Orleans, and decorated with the chief military honours which the royal father had to bestow. Deans and sub-Deans rushed into pedantic poetry; and, in very crippled Latin verse, foretold the future greatness and happiness of the little Duke; whose destiny they had thus no sooner settled, than he straightway died, to shame the prophets; and on the coffin of the child, in his fourth year, was coined the lie, that therein reposed "the most high and puissant Prince," with a long line of sounding titles, to give dignity to the mendacity.

Henri bestowed the lapsed ducal title of Orleans upon his third son, Gaston, a Prince who was so named after the famous warrior, Gaston de Foix; whom he further resembled by wearing a sword on his thigh, a sash across his breast, and a plumed cap upon his head; but, unlike the noble De Foix, he had neither courage to wield his sword, nor a heart true to any cause, nor a head furnished with brains enough to hint to him the consequences of his own folly. "MONSIEUR," as he was called, did not succeed to the title of Orleans until he had advanced to manhood. In the mean time, his youth was passed amid a perplexing multiplicity of teachers. By some he was taught to be a bigot; by others, a hypocrite; by a third, a pedant; while the ex-soldier, D'Ornano, was so wroth with the innate obstinacy of his pupil, that he used to walk abroad with a couple of rods tied to his waist. These he was constantly holding up, *in terrorem*, above the royal pupil's person; but their descent was ever deprecated by Madame d'Ornano; and this farce was so constantly played, that Gaston came, at last, to look upon the rods with no more respect than what he threw away upon the wearer. He was naturally uncourteous and rude; so much so, that on one occasion, having treated with coarse incivility the Gentlemen of his Chamber, his tutor called up the scullions from the kitchen, to wait upon a Prince who knew not how to accept the attendance of men of higher rank. This was the most practically useful lesson which he ever received from any of his preceptors.

At an early age he was married, sorely against his will, to Mademoiselle de Montpensier, of the turbulent house of Guise. The vast fortune of the lady alone reconciled the recalcitrant bridegroom, whose own immense fortune, bestowed on him with the title of Duke of Orleans, was not sufficient for his great appetite for filthy lucre. His whole life was engaged in conspiring, and in betraying his confederates. He really seemed to delight in conducting them into danger, and in refusing to help them out of it, even when he had but to extend his hand to do so. He was as unstable as water, and so infirm of purpose, as to be always of the advice of the last comer. He maintained a

most regal state in his splendid palace, the chief saloons in which, however, were devoted to the purpose of a common gambling-house. He himself played deeply: nor was play his only vice. He was faithless, both as husband and subject,—untrue alike to consort and to King; and as to the sacred truth, he had no more scruple in violating it, when it suited his purpose, than has that exemplary personage, Nicolai, Czar of all the Russias! The "*parole de gentilhomme*" of the latter Prince is about of as much value as that of Mascarille.

The only trace of intellectuality in Gaston was in the debating club which he kept at his house, where questions of interest were discussed, but where, as in the conversational circles of Tibérius, every guest was required to be of the same opinion as the master of the house. Gaston, too, was famous for the Haroun Alraschid sort of propensity which he had for running about the streets in disguise, and in search of adventures. He often found more than he sought; and returned to his residence, at dawn, with tattered cloak, cudgelled sides, and very unedified brains.

Gaston of Orleans was of that timidity of spirit, and weakness of principle, which may drive men into mean crimes, but which will never lead them to the commission of even small virtues. He was essentially stupid, and yet not uninformed; for, in middle age, he was a great and a good reader. But so was the Emperor Claudius, without being for it a bit the better man. In 1627, his wife died in giving birth to a daughter; and Gaston, who looked to the throne as his own,—for his brother, Louis XIII., was childless,—two days after the death of his consort, was laughingly canvassing the names of high-born ladies, worthy to succeed to her place, and help to found a dynasty. He aimed at achieving what his brother, and his brother's Minister, Richelieu, aimed to extinguish,—popular liberty; and all three had the same selfish end in view,—individual profit. The ochlocracy of the *fauxbourgs*, however, recognised in Gaston their coming man; and when he appeared in the streets, his passage was hailed with shouts of "*Vive la liberté du peuple!*" at which Gaston encouragingly smiled, as Egalité, in similar circumstances, did after him. He privately married Mary of Lorraine; but his union with that lady did not prevent him from being the very meanest and most heartless of seducers; and he wore a gay air amid it all, until his brother Louis XIII., after twenty-three years of sterile union with Anne of Austria, became the father of a Dauphin, whose birth flung down Orleans from the height of his greatness and expectations. The King, we know not wherefore, insisted upon the Duke going through the form of a second and public marriage with Mary of Lorraine. The Church was reluctant to sanction a ceremony, which appeared to throw invalidity on the privately celebrated rite; but the Archbishop of Paris cleverly surmounted the difficulty; and when he had

pronounced the words, "*Ego vos conjungo*," he added, "*In quantum opus est*;" and so saved the honour of the Church, and the inviolability of her ordinances.

The new Duchess of Orleans was a lady of many charms, but without the energy to make them available. She was said to be pretty, without even looking so; and witty, without ever letting it be known. Like the lady in the satire, who "was not born to carry her own weight,"—who could not move across a room without foreign aid, and who ever

"Spoke with such a dying fall,

That Betty rather saw than heard the call,"—

she was subject, or thought herself subject, to fainting fits; and her husband used to witness their recurrence with undisguised laughter. He probably looked upon them as counterfeits; for, commonly, he did not lack courtesy towards his lady. She was, however, undoubtedly, the type of the "lackadaisical" fine lady, whom Dr. Young has so graphically painted:—

"The motion of her lips and meaning eye  
Piece out the idea her faint words deny.  
O listen with attention most profound!  
Her voice is but the shadow of a sound.  
And help, O help! her spirits are so dead,  
One hand scarce lifts the other to her head.  
If there a stubborn pin it triumphs o'er,  
She pants, she sinks away, she is no more!  
Let the robust and the gigantic carve,  
Life is not worth so much;—she'd rather starve:  
But chew she must herself;—ah! cruel fate,  
That Roxalinda can't by proxy eat!"

It is astonishing how long the languid lady ruled the realms of *ton*. Laziness was as strong in them as in Lawrence's dog, which was too lazy to bark, unless it could lean its head against a wall.

We cannot trace the career of the Duke through the half-farce half-tragedy of the Fronde,—that sanguinary comedy, in which the actors struggled for power, and slew one another, now with sharp-pointed epigrams, and anon with as sharp-pointed swords. Gaston behaved throughout like a man coveting a prize which he had not the courage boldly to strike for. Not so his masculine daughter, the great MADemoiselle, whose Memoirs are full of far more extraordinary incidents than were ever invented by the hot and perplexity-stricken brains of fiction. Her sire used the daughter throughout the entire plot, only to betray her when it was failing, and to abuse her when it had exploded. Their quarrels were of the most ignoble quality; but, with all her faults, the daughter was of a far more heroic mould than her sire. The latter, when profit was no longer to be made by plotting, gave up the vocation; and, on being reconciled to Louis

XIV., celebrated the peace between himself and his royal nephew, by giving to the latter a dinner; but the banquet was of such detestable quality, that the young Monarch arose from it disgusted, and retired with a sense of insult which he never forgave. Gaston, thereupon, withdrew into private life, where, so strangely constituted were Princes then, he took a mistress, with whom he indulged in religious pursuits. Thrice a day did this worthy couple afford the congregation assembled at the church which they frequented, the edifying exhibition of a Prince and his concubine seriously "transacting their worship." When he died, exhausted in body and reputation, was it wonderful that France exclaimed, like Shakspeare's sentinel?—"For this relief much thanks!"

Louis XIII., the feeble heir of a mighty sire, was the father of two sons born late in wedlock. The first of these boys was Louis, afterwards the Fourteenth of that name; and the other, Philip, who, in his cradle, bore the title of Anjou, exchanging it in after-life for that of Orleans, which had been worn by his worthless uncle, Gaston. From him was lineally descended that Louis Philippe whose name pointed to his double descent;—from Philippe on the paternal side, and from Louis the XIV. through his mother, who was the grand-daughter of the Count of Toulouse;—the Count being one of the legitimized children of the Grand Monarque and Madame de Montespan.

Before the accession of Louis XIV., the friends of his brother Philippe affected to look upon him as the son of Mazarin. Anne of Austria, however, was innocent of the implied accusation. The charge was, nevertheless, well remembered in the Orleans family. Prior to the period when Louis Philippe sat in the seat of Charles X., the former had ever a sneer ready to fling at the asserted legitimacy of Louis XIV.; but no sooner had that same Louis Philippe become King of the French, than he was heard to declare, that he was proud of his descent from the Great Monarch, although he could only claim the honour through that Monarch's illegitimate offspring.

Philip of Orleans, brother of Louis XIV., was a small, bright-eyed, dark-haired boy, with the nose of a man and the mouth of a doll. He was clever, but shy, and loved rather to be with the ladies, than playing at soldiers with the little Lords. As those ladies were not remarkable for their refinement or morals, the training of the young Prince was in the highest degree pernicious. He lost his father in 1643, before he himself had attained his third year. From that time, there seems to have been a conspiracy to oppose his progress in all useful knowledge. When a boy, his tutors, appointed for form's sake, were ordered by Mazarin to keep him in ignorance, lest he should, by natural aptitude and their aid, become wiser than his brother, the King. The priestly teachers obeyed the commands of their ecclesiastical

superior, and even went a little beyond their commission. They not only made him the pupil of folly, but the slave of sin. His ignorance was deplorable. Even when he had grown to man's estate, he was often unable to read his own writing; and all that he cared for was riotous living, destructive gambling, painted courtzezans, and gay costumes.

He was brave enough to excite the jealousy of the royal brother, who was the object of his contempt or fear, in whose presence he trembled with nervous excitement, and who refused him military employment, lest the reputation of Philip should throw a shade over his own. And yet his boldness in battle was marked by the effeminate anxiety which characterized Pompey's legion of blooming youths,—an anxiety to preserve the utmost beauty of dress and feature amid the turmoil of war, so destructive of both. He was most at home in a ball, where, after all, he looked ridiculous enough, dancing, like a lady, in high-heeled shoes, in order to remedy his want of stature. Though twice married, he never knew the gentle influences of honest affection. He never loved any one thing on earth,—save church-bells when they were ringing the vigil of the dead. He would then go miles to listen to the lugubrious chimes,—driven by the same impulse that made George Selwyn cross seas to be present at hangings and quarterings.

In 1661, the Duke married Henrietta, the last child of Charles I., on whom her sire's eyes never rested, and whose birthplace was in the mansion of the Russells at Exeter, on the site now occupied in that ancient city by "Bedford Row." The little Princess had been christened a Protestant; but soon after Lady Morton had dexterously smuggled her into France, she was, without asking her consent, affiliated to the Church of Rome. This qualified her to be the bride of Philip. The latter, having had conferred on him the fief of Orleans, held by his uncle Gaston, the late Duke, was no mean match for a disinherited and fugitive Princess. The nuptials were celebrated during the season of Lent, 1661; and as the season necessitated maimed rites and some privacy, all France augured that the wedded life which commenced without a ball, would infallibly end with a murder. And so it did.

Louis XIV. hated Henrietta until she became the wife of his brother, and *then* his affection was far warmer than was authorized by the respective positions of the two parties. Henrietta, too, had other lovers; and the intrigues which ensued, to keep the respective lovers ignorant of each other, and the ducal husband, who was himself a monster of infidelity, blind to the guilty conduct of his wife, are enough to convey despair into the soul of any one but a Spanish play-wright, who lives by inventing impossible plots. They who care to study this unclean, unprofitable, and highly-perplexing chapter, may find more to puzzle



than to edify them in the Memoirs of Henrietta, by the Countess de Lafayette.

The character of the individual, and of the times also, is, perhaps, best exemplified in the mission which was confided to Henrietta by her brother-in-law, Louis XIV. That King was desirous of securing the alliance of our Charles II., in his attempt to suppress civil and religious liberty in the Dutch dominions. Henrietta was sent over to England, to buy her brother with a double bribe,—a heavy purse and a lightly-principled lady. From the hands of his own sister, that “most religious and gracious King” accepted both; and, after all, defrauded his purchaser! Charles was so pleased with his painted sepulchre of a mistress, Mdle. Kerouaille, that he created her Duchess of Portsmouth; and Louis XIV. was so delighted with her ready betrayal to him of Charles’s secrets, that he presented her with a title and estate in France. Such was the precious trio who thought to set up Absolutism and Popery on the pedestal from which they had been overthrown by the stern and earnest men of England, in days gone by.

When Henrietta rejoined her husband, she met with but a sorry reception. The Duke of Orleans had been opposed to the visit made by her to this country; and rumour was so busy with the name of the Duchess, as to her acts in her native country, that her husband had some reason to account her as being almost as worthless a personage as himself. Shortly after her return to France, she was effectually poisoned, but in the most bungling of methods. A drugged draught of succory water slew the daughter of our Charles I.; and before Bossuet had well-nigh muttered a hasty prayer over her, the Duke of Orleans was ransacking his wife’s writing-desk. She had died unblushingly, with an assertion of her fidelity to him. In proof that he believed it, the Duke sat down to read all his consort’s private correspondence; and if he found no proof therein of her guilt, it was simply for the reason that every letter was in a cypher that defied discovery. The foiled husband found a retributive pleasure in arranging the splendid funeral ceremony of his deceased consort, in which he displayed the most unimpeachable taste and the utmost amount of heartlessness. He was as pleasantly employed, at a subsequent period, in getting up the ceremonial of the marriage of his reluctant daughter to the King of Spain; and when the broken-hearted bride went forth to the splendid misery which awaited her, she found, in the Gentleman-Usher provided for her by her father’s care, the Chevalier de Lorraine, who was the murderer of her mother!

This poor Queen perished like that mother,—by poison. Her little sister married into the then ducal family of Savoy, from which the present royal family of Sardinia is descended. In that family are to be found the sole surviving representatives of

the Stuarts; and in that direction is allegiance ready to be offered by those English Ultramontanists who deem Victoria an usurper, because she inherits from Elizabeth, whom they impudently pronounce illegitimate.

Philip of Orleans remedied the imaginary sorrows of his widowhood, by espousing Charlotte Elizabeth of Bavaria. This Princess was a plain, swarthy, not over clean, but thoroughly honest, lady. She hated affectations of every kind, and invariably called every thing by its proper name. She was terribly coarse; but under the coarseness lay the jewel, virtue. Her appetite was rather that of a pioneer than a Princess; and she ate and drank more like a dragoon than a Duchess. She only confessed to one sort of delicacy,—a delicacy of stomach; for which her remedy was German sausage, and plenty of it! As for the delicacy which could be ruffled by the universal profligacy that reigned around her, it did not exist in her. She wrapped herself in the mantle of her own good intentions; chronicled (and how graphically!) the sayings and doings of all around her; and laughed loudest, and on best grounds, at those who pretended to laugh at her. She was terribly ugly every where, except in her heart; and people who were fine enough to faint almost on looking at her, were ready to kiss her for her honest wit and her charitable deeds. The least honest act of which she was guilty, was in abjuring Lutheranism, in order to marry a worthless Papist; but she intimates that she had been so badly taught, that she had nothing to abjure; and she was so ill instructed after her "conversion," that she found there was nothing to learn: so that she was in the actual position of "as you were!"

Of her intimate life with the Duke of Orleans, she says, "It was very unpleasant to sleep with MONSIEUR. He could not bear that any one should touch him during his slumbers; consequently, I had to sleep at the very edge of the bed, whence I often tumbled out on the ground like a sack. I was, therefore, enchanted, when MONSIEUR, in all friendship, and without a quarrel, proposed that we should have separate rooms."

The Duke, however, compelled his excellent wife to receive the "ladies" whom he most admired; but the rough courtesy of the Duchess was something like stripes and salt to her husband's mistresses. She loved to scarify these creatures, and then pour brine, instead of balm, into the quivering flesh. She did not spare Maintenon herself; and the widow of Scarron, and wife of Louis, stood in the utmost horror and dread of the terrible Duchess.

She was pre-eminently proud; and, perhaps, that pride was never so irremediably wounded, as when her son, the Duke de Chartres, was driven into a marriage with Mademoiselle de Blois, natural daughter of Louis XII. by Madame de Montespan. "If the shedding of my blood," she says, "could have prevented the

marriage of my son, I would have given it freely." Nothing could win her consent to the match. That of her husband and their son was gained by the godly persuasion of that apostolic man, the famous, or infamous, Dubois. Her behaviour on the evening of the marriage was that of a fury; but it had its comic side, too. "On leaving the table, at the close of the circle in the King's chamber, his Majesty made Madame a very marked and a very low bow, during which she wheeled round so nicely on her heel, that when the King raised his head, he saw nothing but her back, advanced one step towards the door." When her son came up to her, before the whole Court, to kiss her hand, she dealt him a slap in the face, which sounded like a pistol-shot, which caused a general consternation, and which cost the bestower of it the annuity which had been conferred on her by Louis XIV.

The marriage was an unhappy one. Louis bitterly reproached Orleans for the infidelity of his son to the young wife; and Orleans as coarsely reviled Louis for expecting the young husband to behave better to a royal bastard. The princely brothers became as blasphemingly vulgar as two grooms; and were only rendered calm by a hint from a Groom of the Chambers, that their august observations could be heard in half-a-dozen rooms of the palace. They parted in hot wrath. Philip, flurried and heated, sat down in fierce anger to dinner, ate voraciously, drank deeply, rode hard speedily thereupon, and then went to sup with the "ladies of St. Cloud." Flushed and fiery, he again indulged in excesses, against which he had long been warned by his physicians. He was in the act of raising a glass, when his speech became thick. The "ladies" thought he was talking Spanish, and laughed outrageously. Amid the shouts, the Duke rolled over on the ground insensible. Screaming then succeeded to laughter. The Duchesses and Countesses escaped from the terrible scene; and their place was soon after taken by a Confessor, Father Le Trevoux, who began cutting jokes to excite the attention of the unconscious Duke, asking him if he did not know his "dear, darling, little Father Le Trevoux?" Philip died June 9th, 1701. A few hours afterwards, the King was heard rehearsing part of an opera with Madame de Maintenon; and, on the same evening, observing that the grand-daughter of Philip, the Duchess of Burgundy, looked sorrowful, he wondered "what ailed the child!" and was probably surprised at hearing the Duke de Montfort remark, on being asked to play at cards, that he thought cards not exactly suitable, seeing that the Duke of Orleans was not yet quite cold. As for the widowed Duchess, she affected neither sorrow nor indecent joy. When she was informed that the Inevitable Angel and the Inexpressible Change had descended upon Philip of Orleans, "Well, then," was her comment, "let nobody think of compelling me to retire into a

convent; for I won't go there!" She was bound, by her marriage contract, to retire either to a convent, or to the gloomy Castle of Montargis; but she would do neither. She remained at Court, with the sanction of the King, where she spent her life in writing voluminous letters, in which she abused Madame de Maintenon, reviled the Pope, and made smart comments upon her son.

The son and successor of the last Duke, named, like his father, Philip, was born in 1672; and, at four years of age, the sins of the father were visited on the child, in the shape of a fit of apoplexy, so severe, that its effects were recognisable down to the period when another stroke smote him—when a man—dead, on the bosom of his mistress. One of its effects was an extreme weakness of vision, which did not, however, blind the Prince to the seductiveness of vice, in which, at sixteen, he had more experience than any of his contemporaries who had attained threescore. Many tutors were assigned to teach the boy, who had graduated under them in evil knowledge, until he was given to the fiendish instruction of Dubois. This notorious personage, of the rank of an Abbé, was the son of a provincial apothecary, and was privately married to a chambermaid. At the period of his appointment to the guardianship of Philip, he was sixteen years older than his ward. Accomplished as Dubois undoubtedly was, he could teach his pupil little; for the latter, despite his profligacy, had found time to amass as much knowledge as the Abbé, who had no occasion even to teach him to be an atheist, although the tutor did his best to keep him so.

At seventeen the hopeful pupil was married, as we have said, to Mademoiselle de Blois, natural daughter of Louis XIV. The youthful profligate was, at the time, leading a more than usually dissolute life, and was addressing unholy aspirations to the Duchess de Bourbon, the married sister of the bride. He only consented to the marriage on the assurance of Dubois, that it should not act as an obstacle to his intercourse with his sister-in-law. We will not permit ourselves to dwell on the ostentation with which this young man paraded his unclean infamy. His becoming the father of legitimate children by no means tended, as it often does, and always should, to soften and purify the heart. Endowed with vast talents, he knew not how profitably to use any, except in the furtherance of vicious enjoyments. He carried coach-loads of his courtezans with him to battle, without hearing reproof from the King. The Monarch, however, was religiously particular touching the Duke's officers on the staff. He refused to consent to the appointment of one on the ground that he was a Jansenist, and that such a nomination would be a scandal to orthodox religion. "Your Majesty has been misinformed," said Orleans: "the gentleman is not a Jansenist; he is an atheist, and believes in nothing." "In that

case," remarked His Most Christian Majesty, "I consent to his appointment; there is nothing to be said against it!" The field to which such appointment had reference was in Spain, where the Duke acted with courage and skill, but with a view of securing the Spanish Crown to himself. Louis, in a fit of angry jealousy, recalled him; and the hero forgot his disappointment in the strange pastime which he enjoyed with his by far too well-beloved daughter, who had married the Duke de Berri. The last-named Prince was a man of some principle; and, to outrage it, Orleans and his daughter used to indulge, in his hearing, in filthiness of conversation, and break forth into inextinguishable laughter, on observing how much it shocked and disgusted him.

The King affected more anger than he felt at this conduct; and Orleans, in a sort of disgrace, shut himself up in the Palais Royal, where he surrendered himself to the studies of chemistry, astrology, alchemy, and poisons; and passed many hours in attempts to raise the devil, and in writing squibs against the legitimacy of Louis XIV. The Monarch was highly incensed at these attacks, which were first heard of in Holland, and which, combined with the fact, that his legitimate heirs were being fast swept away by the hand of Death, drove him to that unconstitutional act by which he decreed, that, in default of a lineal heir, his crown should descend to the eldest of his male illegitimate children, all of whom he legitimatized, and raised to an equality with Princes of the blood. Louis died soon after, in 1715; and the disregard for him into which he had fallen, is well exemplified by a double illustration. As he was dying, he gazed at Madame de Maintenon, and said, "Madame, my sole consolation is, that we shall soon meet again beyond the grave." "Umph!" muttered the lady, somewhat too audibly; "what a rendezvous he has chosen for me!" The second illustration is, that the breath of life had scarcely floated away, for the last time, from his nostrils, when the Parliament, under the influence of Philip of Orleans, now "Regent," annulled the King's will and decree respecting his illegitimate children, and recognised the Regent himself as next heir, after the young King, Louis XV.

This proximity to the person and inheritance of the boy Monarch terrified that half of France which looked upon the Regent as a poisoner, and accused him as the murderer of those royal Princes, who had hitherto stood, with the youthful Louis, between Orleans and the throne. He was now heir presumptive; but, wicked as he was, he was no slayer of his kind; and the boy King was as safe in his hands, as though that so-called sacred life had been in the keeping of an especial guardian angel. The Sovereign in his teens, too, loved his elder uncle, who wisely left him to the good, but fruitless, teaching of Fleury; while he himself devoted his days to the destruction of



the absolute system of Louis XIV., and his nights to such orgies, as had never before been known out of hell. At these orgies, principally suppers, to which, masked or unmasked, the right of admission could only be purchased by a profession of atheism, beastliness was enthroned and worshipped. The Parisians, however, smiled approvingly at them, while they flung their approbation in showers upon a Prince who was pulling down the Nobility, and promising an extension of popular liberty. He who was so acting had little leisure for sober thought. He had laughed aloud, at the funeral of Louis XIV., at the squabble for precedence between the Parliament and Peers, and he now laughed louder, as he played each against the other for his own purpose. It is astonishing that he was ever able to get through any business at all; for he was generally drunk from midnight till dawn, in company with his daughter, who died from such excess, and similar worthless companions. After uneasy sleep, he woke, depressed and stupid, about noon; was scarcely conscious of his own identity and whereabouts for an hour or two after, then devoted a brief time to the affairs of the nation and bodily exercise, and finally longed lazily for the coming of night, that he might again renew the round of his fiendish joys. There alone he felt himself a "King." His male confederates, in hideous wickedness, assumed the name of his "*roués*." They designed to intimate thereby, that they were ready to be *roué*, or "broke on the wheel," for *his* service; but *he* used to say, that it was because they really deserved to be so punished for their own sins.

In the mean time France was rapidly running down the descent which leads to ruin. Her expenditure was double her income. The annual deficit was annually becoming larger, and a national crash was on the point of occurring, when the gambler, John Law, with blood upon his hands, a refugee from England, appeared in Paris. He had an aptitude for financial scheming; but the Church and the people of France would not permit him to exercise his vocation until he had changed his religion. He was convinced of the errors of Protestantism by the arguments and glances of one of the prettiest and most unprincipled women in France, whose success procured episcopal preferment for her equally unprincipled brother. This being arranged, the great Mississippi scheme was set on foot. People bought visionary tracts of land and worthless scraps of paper, with gold which the Regent wantonly misapplied. Fortunes were made in an hour, and ruin as often effected with equal rapidity. The whole population were possessed by the two terrible devils of uncleanness and covetousness. John Law was, for a time, a deity before whom the noblest ladies in France sat as entirely devoted, as Egyptian ladies at the festival of Mithra. For the sake of money every thing was sold, and virtue was

cheaper than any other commodity. Of all that was holy, ready surrender was made, and Mammon was the only god. In the pursuit of riches, the pursuers flung off all good principles, as obstructions to success; and when at last the terrible catastrophe came, and universal bankruptcy enfolded France, the nation had not a God to turn to; for the people had practically disavowed Him who alone can help those who faint, and can give power to them that lack strength.

We do not pause on the details, so familiar to all, of the financial scheme of Law and the Regent. The consequent ruin was appalling, and was aggravated by famine and insurrection. There was an outbreak in Brittany, which was punished with such rigour, that the name of the Orleans family is hateful in Armoricans ears, even unto this day. When famine, too, and pestilence were at their worst, especially in Marseilles, Dubois was guilty of an act of selfishness, that almost surpasses belief. Pope Clement XI. had loaded three vessels with corn, intended for the relief of the famishing populations of Languedoc. Dubois thought such a charitable deed a censure on his ministry, and he ordered the French Envoy at Rome to prevent the sailing of the ships. The barks, however, *did* put to sea, where they were captured by an Algerine corsair. But the pirate, more Christian in his practice than the Priest, on hearing for what purpose the grain had been originally designed, surrendered his rich booty, and helped the deeply-laden vessels on their way to the haven whither they had been bound.

Dubois hitherto, albeit an Abbé, was not in holy orders. This circumstance did not prevent him, when the wealthy Archbishopric of Cambray became vacant, from pressing the Regent to confer the high dignity upon *him*. The Regent stared at him with astonishment, and then burst into laughter. "You, Archbishop of Cambray!" exclaimed Philip, again and again. "Why not?" said the aspirant; "Alberoni became a Cardinal, and his origin was more lowly than my own." "Why!" remarked the Regent, "you are not even ordained; and I should like to see the Bishop, who would be bold enough to make even a Deacon of you." "Well," answered Dubois, taking him at his word, "that Bishop is not far off,—he is in the next room. I will bring him in to you. Ordain me! He desires no better fun!" Dubois found the Bishop of Nantes in the adjoining apartment, promised him the next vacant Archbishopric, conducted him in triumph to the Regent, to whom he undertook to ordain this singular candidate for admission into the ranks of the priesthood; and Philip, with a smile and a sigh, and a shake of his long periwig, placed the patent of office in the grasp of Dubois. The Archbishop of Rouen having applied for and received the usual dispensations from venal Rome, Dubois, within one hour, was admitted into the three orders of Sub-Deacon, Deacon,

and Priest. He repaired immediately afterwards to the Council of State, where his radiant humour was felt as an insult by the aristocratic members, who hated him with an unparalleled intensity of bitterness. The Prince of Conti was especially eloquent and angry against the triple ordination of the day; but Dubois answered him with the almost blasphemous remark, that, if the case had been irregular, there was precedent for it in the similar proceeding with respect to St. Ambrose.

And then came the ceremony of the consecration of this remarkably unclean Priest. It was celebrated with a splendour which had long been unknown in such matters. Cardinals, Prelates, and Priests, vied with each other in their ostentatious assistance at the solemn rite of recognising a link of the apostolic succession in this son of a country apothecary: and among them, most strange of all, was that Massillon, Bishop of Clermont, who so often dared to be honest, but who disgraced himself on this occasion, by preaching the consecration sermon.

Having become Archbishop, Dubois could not rest content therewith. The Cardinalate would place him above all the secular nobility in France, and to that he now aspired. The Regent lent his influence; but the Regent alone was of no avail. Dubois, accordingly, commenced by a promise to Rome, that he would suppress Jansenism, and bring the Gallican Church under Papal subjection. He then dexterously contrived to enlist on his side George I. of England, who influenced the Emperor of Germany, who, in his turn, interceded with the Pope, who was also warmly pressed by the Pretender. Clement was dying at the time, but he was fond of a joke; and he actually signed a document, in which he stated that he had named Dubois, Archbishop of Cambray, to the dignity of Cardinal, on the special application of James III., King of Great Britain. Dubois was furious, but the Pontiff died, and Dubois set himself vigorously to work, and bought up the entire Conclave of electing Cardinals by bribes. The purchased Conclave accordingly elected Cardinal Conti, (Benedict XIII.,) who had previously bound himself, by a written promise, to create Dubois a Cardinal. The Conclave declared that they had been moved to the election solely by the Holy Spirit. The Pope they had been paid to elect, endeavoured to escape from his promise; but at length the scarlet hat was given to Dubois in 1721. The Regent took him by the hand, and introduced the new Cardinal to the King, solemnly asserting the while, with a broad smile upon his face, that the Holy Father—having observed how zealously the Archbishop of Cambray had worked to secure tranquillity for the State, and peace for the Church in France, when threatened with schism—had been divinely moved, in consequence, to create him a Cardinal. The young King hid his face behind his plumed hat, in order that no one might see that he was laughing, as he expressed his gratification that the

Pontiff had selected a Prelate who had rendered such eminent services. The whole affair ended with a grand commemorative Palais-Royal supper,—the last of the orgies at which Dubois was present; for it is due to him to say that, from that day, he became a methodical man of business, “forswore sack, and lived cleanly.” As the Regent was exhausted by dissipation, the statesmanlike qualities of Dubois were the more important to France; but it must be understood that, in the exercise of them, he was never disturbed by any idea as to virtue and principle. As long as he gained his end, he was not at all particular as to the means.

We have always thought the election of Benedict XIII., who raised Dubois to the Cardinalate, one of the most iniquitously conducted of all the Papal elections. Recently-published State-Papers have, however, revealed a worse. When Wolsey was intriguing for the tiara, he not only bought the majority of Cardinals, but he bound them by an oath to vote for him, and no other. Having received his money, the pious men repaired together to the Sistine chapel, released each other from their oaths, made assurance doubly sure by administering mutual absolution for the sin of perjury, and then went and voted for Wolsey’s rival.

There is something awful in the bold wickedness of some of the members of this Church. As a modern instance, we need but to cite the case of that Dr. Cahill, whose name is indissoluble from the memory of his “glorious idea” of slaughtering English Protestants by a coalition of Continental “Catholic” armies. This champion of his Church, only a month ago, deliberately declared in the “Tablet,” that Roman Priests would infinitely prefer that their flocks should read obscene works, rather than the English Bible. To read *that*, he argued, was heresy, for which the Church has no pardon. But with respect to immorality, that same Church could be lenient. Besides, immorality “cools down with age,” says this so-called disciple of Christ. It may be indulged in, with injury to only one or two; and, above all, there is, according to Dr. Cahill, not a word in the Decrees of the Council of Trent condemnatory of immoral practices. Truly, men of the Dubois stamp are yet to be found within the Roman border; though the ingenuity which sees a permission for the exercise of immorality, on the ground that the Council of Trent said nothing to the contrary, very nearly resembles the argument of the Newgate Chaplain in Jonathan Wild’s time, who declared that he was the more emboldened to indulge largely in punch, because it was a liquor against which nothing was said in Scripture.

When Dubois died, the Duke of Orleans became Prime Minister to the King, then in the full enjoyment of his royal authority; but he was almost entirely unfit for business. He drank deeper

than ever, was far more licentious in his pleasures; and in the pursuit of these he dared to disregard even the claims and rights of nature. He sat daily, or nightly rather, surrounded by a seraglio of beautiful fiends. These ladies were "noble" by birth, bright, brilliant, and beaming as the sunniest of orient dawns, but as impure as any unclean thing that ever sprang from the pit of Acheron. It would not be edifying to rest on the revolting details; but no one who is condemned to study them, can be in the least degree surprised at the old hostility of the people of France to the nobility and the blood-royal. At length the Duke became totally unfit for any serious avocation of life. He was bloated, blotchy, feverishly excitable, and in a permanent state of stolidity, from criminal excesses of every sort. His doctor, Chirac, one day observing that he was more heated than usual, warned him, that without the immediate adoption of a system of moderation, apoplexy was inevitable. The Duke lethargically uttered some infidel witticism in return, and plunged deeper than ever into the most hideous excesses. He knew his peril, and yet despised it; and would not surrender any of his usual indulgences for the mere chance of living another day. "What *was* death? It was only a long sleep," said Philip of Orleans.

On the 2nd of December, 1723, he entered the dressing-room of the last of his "favourites." This was the young Duchess of Phalaris, who was scarcely nineteen, while her "protector" was in his fiftieth year. He found her preparing for a ball, her long hair floating over her shoulders, awaiting the nimble hands of the *coiffeur*, who was to give to it the beauty of order. He seated himself on a couch, and the fair and frail young Duchess flung herself at his feet, her head resting upon his knees. The Prince complained of weariness and head-ache, and begged her to tell him one of those pretty fairy stories, for the invention of which she had no little reputation. Looking up at him, she began smilingly with the words, "Once upon a time a King and Queen"—She had just uttered the last word, when the Duke's head bowed down upon his breast; and, as the Duchess gently moved to his side, he sank upon her shoulder. He had often slept briefly in the same position, and the mistress thought her guilty master was slumbering; but he was dead, and the stiffening of his limbs threw her into such terror, that her pealing screams re-echoed through the galleries of the palace. They were the only funeral knell that sounded his passage to the grave; for scant ceremony, and a formal phrase or two, without a word of eulogy, alone marked the obsequies of the ex-Regent Orleans.

He had not attained the French Crown, of which he once had some prospect, nor the Spanish Crown, of which, also, he once entertained some hopes; but he had married his fourth daughter



(Mdlle. de Montpensier) to the King of Spain, who left her a childless widow, and by whose successor she was very unceremoniously sent back to France, where she died in 1742.

Louis Philippe, the son of the Regent, was born in the year 1703. He was deformed in body, and dull in mind; and his dissolute father used to laugh at the idea of changing the succession to the Crown of France, in favour of such an ape as his son, who, as he was accustomed to add, possessed all the defects of all the other Princes of the blood, without any of their virtues. It was the foolish remark of a foolish man, who had abandoned his child to the company of unprincipled women, and who further corrupted him, by holding such conversations in his presence as even a heathen poet, not distinguished for delicacy, has declared should never be held in the presence of an ingenuous boy. On the other hand, he had for a tutor the Abbé Mauguin, who, a sceptic himself, so impressed his pupil's mind with the eternity and severity of future punishments, that he drove the poor, dull lad nearly insane. He was shy, reserved, and most offensively and ignorantly proud. He became devout upon principle; but he so far yielded to fashion, that he took under his protection a young opera nymph, with whom he conversed on religious and metaphysical subjects: and if his weakness in bowing to the wicked *mode* of the time condemn him, his simplicity and good principle may win for him but a slight degree of censure. Indeed, there was ever in him a singular mixture of gallantry and devotion. He had once been attached to the pious Marie Leczinska, who afterwards became the consort of Louis XV. The attachment was mutual; but policy, stronger than love, gave the Duke to a Princess of Baden, and the daughter of the ex-King of Poland to the Sovereign of France. The separated lovers, wedded to objects not of their especial love, had little subsequent familiar intercourse. On one occasion, however, the Duke had an audience of the Queen, and he was enraptured with the transitory delight of being in her society. In the very midst of their happy conversation, he astonished poor Marie by falling on his knees, and in a loud voice beseeching God to pardon him for the guilty thoughts touching the Queen, with which the Devil had just inspired him! The lady herself laughed, but the Duke did not merit to be laughed at. Marie often said that they would have been admirably matched; for that, while she was at prayers in some convent, her husband would have been with his favourite Fathers of St. Geneviève; and that their hearth would have been an altar of domestic propriety.

Quiet and unobtrusive as this Duke was, he claimed the Prime Ministership; and, on its being refused him, he withdrew into private life. His pride was still more hurt when, by the birth of a son to Louis XV., he ceased to be next heir to the

Crown. He thenceforward devoted himself to the study of theology, of ancient oriental languages, and of controversial divinity. He thought that Heaven had confided to him the mission of converting all the heretics on earth to Christianity. He addressed himself, accordingly, to the composition of argumentative treatises. They were very full of words, but altogether deficient in reasoning; and, as they could not have convinced the author, neither did they carry conviction to the bosom of the few patient readers who waded through them. He passed whole days and nights in disputes with Priests and pedants upon Hebrew points and perplexing passages; and his Sunday afternoons were much more profitably employed in catechising the children on his estate, in the village church. His last days were altogether spent among Priests, in whose company he died in 1752. As he was a Jansenist, these orthodox gentlemen would not administer the sacrament to him,—though Massillon had disgraced himself by preaching the consecration sermon of the atheistical Dubois! His private almoner had no such scruple. The sacrament was administered by him; and this Duke of Orleans died, the only really respectable man of his race, after bequeathing funds to found a Biblical Professorship of Hebrew at the Sorbonne, “in order,” as he said, “that heretics might not be the only Christians who studied the Holy Scriptures in the original languages;”—a satire upon the Church, on whose bosom, however, he was content to die.

Another Louis Philippe succeeded to the title of Orleans. He was the son of the late Duke, and was twenty-seven years of age at his father's death. His childhood had been spent among frivolous women, or coarse grooms. At thirteen he was a full Colonel; and, young as he was, he bore himself, on the many stricken fields which France contested with her foes, with the gallantry of Bayard, the coolness of Duguesclin, and the invincibility of Dunois. His great martial reputation excited the fierce jealousy of Louis XV., who removed him from all active military employment. His domestic life was one of variety, if not of happiness. At eighteen he was married to Henrietta, Princess of Bourbon-Conti. At first, the conjugal love of this pair was so ostentatiously displayed, without respect to place or person, that the individuals who were made witnesses of it, were at once amused and embarrassed. But, as our poet says,—

“These violent delights have violent ends;

Like fire and powder, which, as they kiss, consume.”

So it was in the present instance; but the Duke was not to blame. The youthful Duchess became an unblushing monster of impurity. Compared with her, Messalina was, at least, a decent, if not a virtuous, woman; and strove to save her imperial dignity from stain by committing foul deeds under a feigned

name,—Lycisca, “the Daughter of Joy.” Henrietta of Orleans observed no such poor respect for appearances; and the mother of Philippe Egalité was worthy of her child.

The Duke of Orleans was, with all this, no anchorite. He was the bosom friend of Pompadour,—that shameless woman, whom Heaven had endowed with such ability to become a great artist in sculpture, and who abused that and every other gift of God. He was bad enough to be suspected of confederacy in the affair of the regicide Damien; but he was simply a debauchee, whose excesses plundered his family, but whose thoughts never turned to the slaying of his King.

His unbridled extravagance had so embarrassed his fortunes, that he was determined to repair them for the benefit of his son, the Duke de Chartres, by marrying him to an heiress. His eyes rested on the person of Mademoiselle de Penthievre, daughter of the Duke of that name, who was the son of the Count of Toulouse,—illegitimate offspring of Louis XIV. and Madame de Montespan. The pride of the Duke of Orleans made him, at first, recoil from an alliance for his son with the illegitimate line. But strong reasons reconciled him to it. The wealth of the other illegitimate branches was, by deaths, or in expectation, fast settling in the Penthievre family, ultimately to centre on Mademoiselle de Penthievre, whose only brother, the Prince de Lamballe, was being driven by profligacy into the grave. The Duke of Orleans, therefore, hoped to secure with this lady the whole of a fortune, which is said to have amounted to nearly a quarter of a million sterling annually. The preliminary arrangements had all been concluded, when the Prince rallied, and became convalescent. The Duke of Orleans at once broke off the engagement, seeing that the lady was likely to be only half as rich as he had expected. He had made an indignant enemy of the father by such a course, when suddenly the Prince de Lamballe died. Mademoiselle de Penthievre became thereby the wealthiest of heiresses; and the Duke of Orleans had the effrontery, once more, to solicit her hand (and estates) for his son. The lady's father refused; but the lady herself was passionately attached to the Duc de Chartres; and as she threatened death, or a convent, if she were not permitted to espouse the greatest *roué* of his day, the parental consent was reluctantly yielded; the illustrious couple were united; and Louis Philippe, who so recently died in exile in England, after running through every variety of fortune, was the first fruit of the union.

This marriage took place in 1768. Five years subsequently, the Duke of Orleans, then a widower living in strict retirement, alienated from the Court, at Villers-Cotterets, one morning, before mounting his horse, said to the gentlemen who formed a species of “Court” also in that rural palace, words somewhat like these: “My good friends, I depart alone; but this evening

I shall return in company with a lady, to whom I trust your homage and good-will will be as readily paid, as they have ever been to me." The Duke left a perplexed circle of household officers behind him; but their perplexity was ended when the evening arrived. With it came the Duke, leading by the hand Madame de Montesson, whom he had that day privately married with the contemptuous consent of the King, and on condition that the union should never be formally declared or recognised. The lady was of great beauty, grace, and intellect. She had been the young wife of an old Count, to whom she remained faithful, till his death left her free. The Duke showed his esteem for her by abandoning the Palais Royal, and selling St. Cloud to Marie Antoinette, because in neither of those ducal residences could his wife keep state as Duchess. He lived with her at the pretty mansion of St. Assize au Port,—that mansion which the famous Duchess of Kingston subsequently purchased, where she gave such magnificent breakfasts, dinners, and suppers, and from the woods round which she sold rabbits by thousands. Perhaps no Duke of Orleans ever experienced more happiness than was here the lot of the father of *Egalité*. From his retreat he looked at public events, and was content to obtain popularity by exhibiting much benevolence and general propriety, when at Versailles there was neither sympathy for the people nor self-respect. The Duke enjoyed this life during twelve years; and then (in 1785) died of gout, in the arms of Madame de Montesson, his excellent wife,—although she *was* the aunt of the Countess de Genlis!

The Orleans family could not respect the virtues of the Duke's widow. A mention made of her, in the Duke's funeral oration, by the Abbé de St. Maury, rendered the new Duke of Orleans perfectly furious. She was respected by all other men, of every shade of party. The Revolution did not smite her, and the Empire treated her with especial courtesy. Napoleon admired her noble bearing and her womanly qualities; and till the year of her death, in 1806, the imperial purse annually poured into her lap the generous tribute of thirty thousand francs. The non-recognition of her marriage, and the hatred of Philippe *Egalité*, procured for her oblivion from the Republic, and a pension from the Empire.

The Château of St. Cloud was the birth-place of Louis Philippe Joseph of Orleans, better known as Philippe *Egalité*. He was thirty-eight years of age when he succeeded his father in 1785. As Duke of Chartres, he had run a most profligate career; and, throughout its wretched course, he was weaker of principle and purpose, than any of the Dukes who have borne the fatal title of Orleans. He was employed both in the navy and army; but, though he was not ill-disposed to fulfil the duties of both professions, he never distinguished himself in either. He was more

at home in a race than in a battle; and the morals of the times may be judged of, when we state, that he once rode a match against time, from St. Cloud to Paris, *naked*! He pierced the clouds in a balloon, descended into the bowels of the earth to inspect mines, shook the powder from his hair, abolished breeches to introduce pantaloons; and had his children christened, not in palaces, as became young Christians born in the purple, but in the parish church, like common citizens: in short, he was looked upon as a man who treated both fashion and royalty with seditiousness of spirit. The only points in which he behaved as was common with French Princes, was in treating his wife with such faithlessness, that she ultimately parted from him in disgust; and in delivering his children to be educated by his mistress, the notorious Countess de Genlis; whose nonsensical books used to be so extensively read by multitudes of young ladies, who, now that they are grandmothers, blush to think of that misapplication of their time. To our thinking, the plays of Aphra Behn are not much worse than the *nouvelettes* of Sillery de Genlis.

While the Court at Versailles was merry with an annual deficit of £6,000,000 sterling, added to an established arrear of above ten times that sum, and while the people were enduring the utmost of misery and oppression, the Duke took the popular side. He was banished to his estate; and this increased his popularity. His recall, at the bidding of the people, who framed a "humble" petition with that end in view, was a defeat for the Court and a triumph for democracy. Of the latter the Duke became the recognised champion; and, being elected a member of the *Tiers Etat* at the States-General, he chose rather to take his place among the Commons, to which he had been elected, than by the side of the King, where he could seat himself when he would, by right of birth. It is not necessary to enter into the history of the French Revolution,—that great catastrophe which he aided to establish, and through which he perished. By the Revolutionists he was employed as a tool, until he was no longer needed; and then he was destroyed. The Republicans accepted the help of a Prince to overthrow royalty; but, when that was achieved, they slew the Prince, as a portion of what was necessarily devoted to destruction. Against the prayers of his family, and to the disgust of his own confederates, he voted for the death of his cousin, the King, into whose place he hoped to leap. But, when the place no longer existed, a candidate for its honours, or for any sovereignty over the people,—the only Sovereign of the hour,—was a traitor to the State; and Philippe Egalité miserably perished under the knife of the executioner, leaving behind him a trebly-accursed memory. His regicide vote against Louis XVI. has long been considered as the most damning spot upon his fame. It is, perhaps, not the worst.



Among the blackest, we are disposed to consider his unfilial treachery before the Commune, when he declared his belief that he was not the son of the last Duke, but of some plebeian paramour of his mother's. He gained nothing by striving to prove that he was sprung from a democratic paternity; for he was still the son of a Bourbon Princess. Evil, indeed, was her reputation; but, evil as it was, no duty called upon her son to heap fresh infamy upon it, still less to do so by the utterance of a lie.

He was succeeded in his title by Louis Philippe, the late ex-King of the French. Louis Philippe—first, Duke of Valois, then of Chartres, and then of Orleans—had seen Voltaire in his early youth, and had learned a motley sort of wisdom at the knees of Madame de Genlis. This lady taught her pupils sentiment, made them comedians, filled them to the brim with “gallons of facts,” had them taught various professions, as well as languages, and made them as conceited as little Cyrus himself. They accompanied her on instructive tours. On one of these occasions, they visited the prison at Mont St. Michel, where stood that famous wooden cage, not unlike the iron one in which Anne of Beaujeu had once imprisoned a former Duke of Orleans. Louis Philippe, then a boy, had the honour of destroying this relic of the despotism of the ancient monarchy; and he used to allude to the circumstance, with much emotion, after he had realized the dreams of so many Princes of his house, and was a King, albeit an uncrowned one. From the residence of Beaumarchais, Louis Philippe, with his brothers, sisters, and governess, witnessed the destruction of the Bastille; and he was so excited with wild delight at the spectacle, that even the Countess counselled him to moderate the public manifestation of his enjoyment.

He became as democratic as his sire. He surrendered his titles, took the post of door-keeper in the Jacobin Club, snubbed his mother, called Madame de Genlis “dear mamma,” and declared that there were but two things on earth which he loved, and those right dearly; namely, the new Constitution and herself. He fought for the Republic at Valmy and Jemappes, and fled from it as soon as he saw that the scaffold was likely to be his reward, if he tarried within the frontier. He would not serve under Austria against France; and so, penniless and disguised, he became a wanderer. He travelled on foot through Switzerland, under the name of Corby; rejoined his sister, Adelaide, for a brief interval; when, being discovered by the Government of the Republic, the fugitives were compelled to separate. The young Prince did not abandon Switzerland, but procured an engagement in an academy at Richerau, where, as M. Chabaud Latour, he taught the mathematics to very soft-looking boys, it they at all resembled those in the famous picture in the Palais Royal, at £60 *per annum*. His whereabouts being again disco-

vered, he was forced to depart. He traversed the northern countries of Europe, and ultimately sailed from Hamburgh to the United States, where, in the same year, (1796,) he was joined by his young and princely-hearted brothers, Montpensier and Beaujolais. After a four years' sojourn beyond the Atlantic, the exiles landed at Falmouth. The Princes whom we have last named died early, their constitutions having been destroyed by the rigours of their captivity, under the Republic, at Marseilles, and by the sufferings endured by them in an attempt to escape. During the succeeding eight or nine years, the Duke of Orleans was chiefly in England, and never idle. He proposed to Canning to take the command of an expedition to prevent the French from getting possession of the Ionian Islands; and he was sorely tempted into taking an active part against Napoleon in Spain. Luckily for him, he did not assume arms against his country; and, as he could not attain greatness in the field, he resolved to help himself thereto by marriage. In 1809 he espoused the Princess Maria Amelia of Naples, whose mother was the sister of Marie Antoinette. A son was born of this marriage, in Sicily, in 1810; and this occurrence afforded him as much enjoyment as an exile could sustain, until the year 1814 brought with it the downfall of the Empire. On a May morning of that year he left Palermo; and, not many days afterwards, the porter of the Palais Royal was surprised at seeing a goodly-looking man pass the portals, advance to the staircase, and, falling upon his knees, kiss the ground, while he sobbed with hysterical excitement. The strange comer was the Duke of Orleans. His first personal visit in Paris was paid to Madame de Genlis, who received him like a school-dame, and hoped that he "had given up all idea of becoming King." He also called upon the leading liberals of the day; and, even then, Lafayette said of him, that he was "the only Bourbon compatible with a free constitution." These words were the seeds whence sprang "the best of Republics" in 1830.

Then came the "Hundred Days," the issue of which Louis Philippe tranquilly awaited at Twickenham. After the crowning day at Waterloo, he repaired again to Paris; and, in the House of Peers there, he took so decided an opposition standing against the Court, that the King withdrew from the Princes of the blood the courtesy privilege of sitting in the Senate.

The Duke had his revenge when the little Duc de Bordeaux was born,—the son of an already slain sire. There appeared at the time, in the "Morning Chronicle," a strongly-worded protest against the legitimacy of the little Duke. The King charged Louis Philippe with being the author of the protest. The latter vehemently denied the charge; but he re-published the protest itself in 1830, when his partisans were placarding the streets with the assurance that he had not in him the blood of Bourbon,

but that of Valois. Long before the death of Louis XVIII., he appears to have discussed, with the coterie at Lafitte's, the advantages of a monarchical change in France; and these discussions never failed to be marked by his assurances, that if he could ever wish to become King, the general good, and not self-interest, would be the parent of such wish! In the mean time, he good-humouredly abided his hour. His household was the only "decent" one, in the proper sense of the word, that had ever been held by a Duke of Orleans. He himself was much given, indeed, to "nearness;" and he regulated the expenses of his children's table with a saving minuteness, which shows how admirably nature had qualified him to be the head of a cheap boarding-school. He knew, if not every thing, at least a little of every thing; and he loved to teach others, in order that he might exhibit his own knowledge. We have already alluded to the pride with which he used to speak of his "august ancestor, Louis XIV." "Yes, Dumas!" said he, one day, to the Secretary, who has since turned historian, "to be descended from Louis XIV., even only through his bastards, is, in my eyes at least, an honour sufficiently great to be worth boasting of!" He was charitable upon impulse, rather than principle; but his promised liberality often became "fine by degrees, and beautifully less," when its hour of expected realization approached.

It was only a few days previous to the outbreak in 1830, that he was playing with the youthful Duke de Bordeaux in the gardens at St. Cloud. His affection had never been so expansive. Not many months before he had refused to accept the office of a Twelfth-Night King, at Court, because it savoured, as he pleasantly said, of treason. He ever professed too much, just as his wretched father conspired too much; and he was most affectionate to the son of the Duke de Berri, at the moment that he was about to rob him of his birth-right. He, too, had infirmity of purpose. He was concealed when his sister Adelaide accepted the office of "Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom," preparatory to a further step. His own hesitation was remarkably unheroic. When the Duke de Mortemart repaired to him in Paris, he found the Prince stretched on a mattress on the ground, reeking with perspiration and anxiety. No human power, he told the envoy of Charles X., should induce him to accept a throne to which he had no right. A few days after, he had shipped the elder Bourbon branch in two vessels, bound for England. A third accompanied the exiles; and when the latter inquired the object of this third, they were told that the ship of war had orders to fire upon the vessels which bore the fugitives and their scattered fortunes, if a landing were attempted on the coast of France. Such was the last "Good night!" of the courteous Orleans to the ancient monarchy.

By the elevation of Louis Philippe to the uneasy dignity of

King of the French, the title of Duke of Orleans fell to that young Prince, whose birth we recorded as having taken place in Sicily in 1810. He was brought up, not among Princes, but among the people. We have a lively remembrance of his appearance among his fellow-pupils in one of the public colleges, and of the popularity with which the fact itself was hailed. He was the last of the Dukes of Orleans, and, perhaps, the most amiable. The Church, indeed, hated him, because he had married a German Lutheran Princess, and would insist upon her religious feelings being respected. He had been to pay a visit of duty to his royal parents, when, on his return, the horses of his carriage took fright, and, in leaping out, he was killed. He left heirs who, now in exile, are unwisely taught to consider themselves the heirs of their grandsire's greatness, and their father's prospects. They could not well hope for a greater heritage of woe, seeing that, since the days of Louis XV., no French Monarch, save Louis XVIII., has died upon the throne. The Sixteenth Louis perished on the scaffold; the Seventeenth in the Temple; the leaders of the Republic were murdered by their rivals; the Emperor died upon a distant rock; Charles X. breathed his last sigh at Goritz; and Louis Philippe expired in 1850, also in exile, at Claremont. What a warning to those who, since the death of the last-named King, have been eager to reign! What a warning even to him who, most daring, has been most successful!

Eighteen Princes have borne the title of Dukes of Orleans. Four were of the elder branch of Valois. Five were of the Angoulême branch of Valois; the other half of the eighteen Princes were members of the House of Bourbon. Of all these, who had grown up to manhood, two alone may be said to have been distinguished for eminent respectability of character,—the son of the Regent, and the son of Louis Philippe, King of the French: but even the reputation of these was not unsullied. The greater number perished miserably. The first Philip was killed by excess, Louis was murdered, Charles slowly killed by his quarter of a century's captivity, and Louis (the first Duke who reached the throne) perished through profligacy. Of the second Valois branch, the first who had worn the ducal title was killed, the second and third died prematurely, the fourth perished a moody maniac, and the fifth was assassinated; and of the last five, three were Kings. Again, of the Bourbon Dukes of Orleans, the first died ere he left the nursery; the next, Gaston, if public contempt could have killed him, would so have ended his career; the father of the Regent, and the Regent himself, were "suicides," slaying themselves by practices of vice; the fifth of the house died with decency; the sixth was the slave of excess, like so many of his predecessors, and he suffered accordingly; Philippe Egalité was the only one of the ducal line who suffered death at the hands of the executioner; his son, Louis

Philippe, the only one who encountered the Inevitable in banishment; the last Duke perished ignobly on the pavement of Paris. Not one fell in the field, or died of the effects of over-zeal in the service of his country. Should the line of Dukes ever be renewed, let us hope that it may not be said of these, as was said of the Bourbons after the Restoration, that during the days of their adversity, they had neither learned nor forgotten any thing. But well may we say, *should* the ducal line ever be restored:—

“ *Ubi cras istud aut unde petendum ?* ”

---

- ART. IV. 1.—*The Works of William Harvey, M.D., Physician to the King, Professor of Anatomy and Surgery to the College of Physicians.* Translated from the Latin, with a Life of the Author, by ROBERT WILLIS, M.D. London: Printed for the Sydenham Society. 1847.
2. *The Genuine Works of Hippocrates.* Translated from the Greek, with a Preliminary Discourse and Annotations, by FRANCIS ADAMS, LL.D., Surgeon. London: Printed for the Sydenham Society. 1849.
3. *Memorials of John Ray: (consisting of his Life, by DR. DERHAM; Biographical and Critical Notices by SIR J. E. SMITH, CUVIER, and DUPETIT THOUARS;) with his Itineraries, &c.* Edited by EDWIN LANKESTER, M.D., F.R.S., &c. London: Printed for the Ray Society. 1846.
4. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. (Medical Biographies, contributed by WILLIAM ALEXANDER GREENHILL, M.D., Trinity College, Oxford.)* Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. Three Vols. London: Taylor, Walton, and Maberly; and John Murray. 1843.

WE sometimes hear the inquiry, “Have not the discoveries made in science nearly exhausted the subject? Will not philosophers soon be left without objects on which to exercise their skill?” Conclusions in the affirmative are naturally arrived at by those who take cognizance of the vast field through which human intellect has ranged, without realizing how the area becomes enlarged, rather than diminished, in the progress of inquiry. Each discovery leads to the knowledge of new relations; whilst the investigation of these, in turn, brings to light new facts. The unsophisticated dweller in the recesses of some deep valley is apt to limit his ideas of the world to what is bounded by his narrow horizon; but, when he leaves his secluded home, and scales the mountain heights, that horizon expands. Each upward step widens the prospect, and brings new objects within the range of his vision; and, when he has surmounted



every obstacle, and stands upon the loftiest peak, hills and valleys, oceans and plains, appear in that glorious profusion which distinguishes the natural world, when seen from the right elevation.

This was clearly apprehended by Seneca. "Truly," says the illustrious Stoic, "they who preceded us have done much; but they have not done all. Much work yet remains, and will remain; nor, after a thousand ages have passed away, will any one be precluded from adding something." The observation of the Roman sage applies to every branch of science; but, when uttered by him, it was especially pertinent to the subject of the works at the head of this article, since it is one with which the ancients had but little acquaintance. Though a few bright luminaries shone the more vividly from the depth of the surrounding darkness, their light was dimmed in struggling through the dense atmosphere of hypothesis: it shone with a pale and feeble ray.

It might have been anticipated, that the pressing wants of humanity would, from the earliest ages, have induced men to give their chief attention to the discovery of the means best calculated for their relief. Since disease and death sooner or later assailed all men, we should have anticipated, that those investigations would have made the greatest progress, which tended to neutralize the power of man's universal foe. But how far was this from being the case! The rhapsodies of the poet have ever had more charms for man, in his archaic state, than the investigations of the philosopher. The taste which first manifested itself in eulogistic songs, recording the traditional glories of ancestors, the achievements of warriors, and the greatness of nations, every where gave a bias to the national mind. The Homeric poems and the dramas of Æschylus, the lyrics of Terpander and Alcæus, of Sappho, Pindar, and Anacreon, had taken their places in the national literature of Greece, long before the father of medicine had completed his illustrious career.

Of the state of anatomical science, prior to the time of Hippocrates, we know but little; but he was obviously not its founder. Democritus, his tutor in literature and philosophy, had devoted attention both to Anatomy and Medicine. At a still earlier period, some knowledge of it was obtained by Pythagoras. How far Æsculapius and his sons, Machaon and Podalirius, were concrete existences, or mythic personages, we have no means of ascertaining; but it has been supposed that the former of these Homeric heroes left a race of representatives in the Priest-Physicians, who ministered at the *Asclepia*, or "Temples of Health," scattered through Greece. These institutions, to which the people flocked for the relief of their physical ills, were often located in the vicinity of mineral springs.

What was the amount of anatomical knowledge possessed by the men who presided over them, we have no means of ascertaining; but, since the office was hereditary in particular families, some amount of such lore must have been possessed by them, and transmitted from father to son, though its quantity was, doubtless, small.

Our actual information respecting the state of this science commences with the age of Hippocrates, with whose celebrated aphorism, "Life is short, and art is long," many are familiar, though few are aware that its author was contemporaneous with the Prophet Malachi. His father was a Priest-Physician in one of the *Asclepia*, where the son doubtless learnt the elements of the science to which he devoted his prolonged life. In estimating the value and amount of his anatomical knowledge, we must remember to how limited an extent human dissection was practised, both in his age and for centuries afterwards. The reasons for this do not appear very obvious. Care for the dead seems to result from an emotional instinct common to humanity. Civilized or savage, with few exceptions, man respects the remains of departed friends; and, from this innate disposition, doubtless, originated a strong popular prejudice, which, in some measure, remains operative even in our own day. In ancient times it appears to have been still more intense; and, except for a brief period in the Alexandrian school of medicine, we have few indications that anthropotomy was generally employed. Galen, in one of his works, refers to the very great advantages possessed by the physicians who accompanied Aurelian in his German wars, since they had the opportunity of dissecting the bodies of their slain enemies; evidently implying that, even in his day, no such opportunities were available at Rome. The dissection of the inferior animals was more usually resorted to; consequently, in its early dawn, the study of Anatomy tended in the direction of what we now designate *Comparative*. There is extant a tradition that Hippocrates possessed a skeleton, which, at his death, he left to the Temple of Apollo at Delphi; but this is scarcely compatible with the recorded imperfections of his own knowledge.

With the great leading outlines of Human Anatomy he was, of course, familiar. With the two plates of the bones of the cranium and their intervening cancellous structure, the *dura mater*, or protecting membrane of the brain, and its prolongation downward, dividing the brain into two hemispheres, as well as the vascular canals permeating ordinary bones, were all known to him. Of the sutures of the skull, or lines separating the bones, he had but a very imperfect knowledge. Respecting the distribution of the blood-vessels, his information was still more scanty, as shown in the following description, which we quote, because, though the ludicrous admixture of truth and error

which it contains can scarcely be appreciated by the general reader, the notions involved in it lay at the foundation of fallacies which maintained their ground up to the time of Harvey:—

“Veins run towards it (the brain) from all parts of the body, many of which are small, but two are thick,—one from the liver, and the other from the spleen. And it is thus with regard to the one from the liver: a portion of it runs downwards through the parts on the right side, near the kidney, and the *psaos* muscle, to the inner part of the thigh, and extends to the foot. It is called the *vena cava*. The other runs upwards by the right veins and the lungs, and divides into branches for the heart and the right arm. The remaining part of it rises upwards across the *clavicle*, to the right side of the neck, and is superficial, so as to be seen. Near the ear it is concealed, and there it divides. Its thickest, largest, and most hollowed part ends in the brain; another small vein goes to the right ear, another to the right eye, and another to the nostril. Such are the distributions of the hepatic vein; and a vein from the spleen is distributed on the left side, upwards and downwards, like that from the liver, but more slender and feeble.”—*Works of Hippocrates, Dr. Adams's Translation*, vol. ii., p. 848.

It appears to us, that this absurd jumble can only be accounted for, on the supposition that Hippocrates had never seen these vessels displayed in a dissection. It is more probable that his knowledge was obtained piecemeal, as such a distinguished operative surgeon would have many opportunities of doing; and that, guided by the dissection of the lower brutes, he framed an hypothetical combination of these vessels and their assumed distribution. How inferior this knowledge of the fundamentals of *his* art, to that which must have been possessed by other men of the same age, in *their* respective departments!—

“He had for his contemporaries Pericles, the famous statesman; the poets Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and Pindar; the philosophic Socrates, with his disciples, Plato and Xenophon; the venerable father of history, Herodotus, and his young rival, Thucydides; the unrivalled sculptor, Phidias, with his illustrious pupils; and many other distinguished names that have conferred immortal honour on the age in which they lived, and exalted the dignity of human nature.”—*Preliminary Discourse by Dr. Adams*, p. 10.

A fit companion to the above illustration of the anatomical knowledge of Hippocrates, is the following specimen of his physiology:—

“When a person draws in air by the mouth and nostrils, the breath (*πνεῦμα*) goes first to the brain, then the greater part of it to the internal cavity, and part to the lungs, and part to the veins, and from thence it is distributed to the other parts of the body along the veins; and whatever passes to the stomach cools, and does nothing more. And so also with regard to the lungs. But the air which enters the veins is of use (to the body), by entering the brain and its ventricles;

and thus it imparts sensibility and motion to all the members; so that, when the veins are excluded from the air by the phlegm, and do not receive it, the man loses his speech and intellect, and the hands become powerless, and are contracted, the blood stopping, and not being diffused as it was wont."—*Dr. Adams's Translation*, vol. ii., p. 849.

Hippocrates drew no distinction between the arteries, or vessels which convey the blood from the heart, and the veins which bring it back again; and, in common with most of the ancients, appears to have considered that some of the veins—that is, the arteries—received *air* from the lungs, and distributed it through the system,—an error into which they were doubtless led by the circumstance, that after death these vessels are rarely found to contain any of the blood which in life pulsed through them with an unceasing flow. The importance which he attached to the relation between the liver and the veins, long continued to receive the sanction of anatomical schools. On the other hand, it appears clear that he connected psychological phenomena with the brain. Thus, when writing on the subject of epilepsy, or "the sacred disease," which he declares to be no more a special infliction from the gods than are other diseases, but traceable to natural causes, he says,—

"And men ought to know that from nothing else but thence (the brain) come joys, delights, laughter, and sports, and sorrows, griefs, despondencies, and lamentations. And by this, in an especial manner, we acquire wisdom and knowledge, and see, and hear, and know what are foul and what are fair, what are bad and what are good, what are sweet and what are unsavoury. Some we discriminate by habit, and some we perceive by their utility. By this we distinguish objects of relish and disrelish, according to the seasons; and the same things do not always please us. And by the same organ we become mad and delirious, and fears and terrors assail us, some by night and some by day, and dreams, and untimely wanderings, and cares that are not suitable, and ignorance of present circumstances, desuetude, and unskilfulness. All these things we endure from the brain when it is not healthy, but is more hot, more cold, more moist, or more dry than natural, or when it suffers any other preternatural or unusual affection. And we become mad from humidity (of the brain). As long as the brain is at rest, the man enjoys his reason."—*Idem, ibid.*, p. 865.

After enumerating a number of other phenomena connected with nervous diseases, he adds,—

"This is the interpretation of those things which emanate from the air, when it (the brain) happens to be in a sound state. But the air supplies sense to it; and the eyes, the ears, the tongue, and the feet administer such things as the brain cogitates."—*Idem, ibid.*, p. 865.

The amount of sound observation indicated in these extracts, is most remarkable. To arrive at such broad generalizations

respecting the physiology of any portion of the nervous system, is in itself a striking illustration of the writer's vigorous understanding, and his worthiness of the high intellectual position which has been assigned to him in every age. At the same time, the above conclusions were such as a mind like his could arrive at independently of dissection; though his connexion of the organs of sense with the great centre of the nervous system, indicates a knowledge of the nerves through which that connexion was established.

We do not dwell upon the well-merited fame enjoyed by Hippocrates as a practical surgeon; though this is a subject on which we might speak in terms of unmeasured eulogy. It is solely as an Anatomist that our theme requires a glance at his attainments as evidenced in his works, and in illustration of the progress of Anatomical Science.

There is extant an ancient production "On the Heart," supposed by some commentators to be a genuine work of Hippocrates, but rejected by most others as spurious. Whoever was its author, its high antiquity is undoubted. On many points the writer had made a great advance upon his predecessors. He was familiar with the muscular structure of the heart; with its division into four cavities; with its pericardium, or investing sac, and its contained fluid; with its connexion with the veins, and its function as the central organ whence flowed the nutritive fluid. All these important truths indicate the practical knowledge of an anatomist who had dissected what he described. But how little his labours were known or appreciated, is seen in the wild and fanciful speculations in which subsequent writers continued to indulge.

Contemporaneous with Hippocrates was Euryphon, a physician of Cnidos, who appears to have been the first to distinguish the arteries from the veins, and to have been aware that, in the living being, the former vessels contained blood, and not air.

We should not expect much anatomical information from Plato. Nevertheless, in his *Timæus*, we find him describing the veins springing from the heart, and receiving blood from thence. But whilst, like Hippocrates, he drew no distinction between the arteries and the veins, he also concluded, that some of these vessels took their rise from the liver. It will appear strange to non-professional readers, that the liver should be so conspicuously introduced by most of the ancients amongst the number of circulating organs. But this was not an improbable error for them to fall into. After the blood has passed through the various parts of the body, the greater portion of it returns by the veins *direct* to the heart, which then propels it into the lungs to undergo purification from the superfluous carbon. But the veins which arise from the stomach, spleen, intestinal canals, and gall-bladder, unite to form one large detached trunk, called



the "portal vein," which proceeds, not towards the heart, but to the liver, dividing into two large branches, which plunge into the substance of the gland, to every part of which its further subdivisions are distributed. From the blood which this vessel conveys to the liver, the bile is separated; and, having fulfilled this special mission, the residue returns, by two additional veins, into one of the great venous trunks, to be conveyed to the heart. Seeing a large vessel, turgid with blood, apparently issuing *from* the liver, and distributing its only visible branches, resembling those of the other veins, to the organs just enumerated, nothing was more natural than for the ancients, ignorant of the Harveyan circulation, to regard the large vein as receiving its blood *from*, rather than distributing it *to*, the liver. This vein really resembles a rooted and branched plant torn up from the soil; the roots and rootlets representing the veins arising from the alimentary canal and spleen; the stem, or trunk, the large single portal vein; and the branches corresponding with the ramifications of the vein, diffusing themselves through the liver. But the idea of a vein branching at both ends, never suggested itself to the earlier anatomists. They regarded the *visible* branches of the portal vein as the only ones it possessed; and hence their perplexity, and consequent confusion of the liver with the organs of circulation.

Plato regarded the blood-vessels as messengers, transmitting to the body the orders of the soul; assigning to them functions, which, as we are now aware, belong solely to the nervous system. He also considered the mind to present three distinct faculties, which employed different organs as their seats and instruments: firstly, the concupiscent, located in the liver; secondly, the irascible, in the heart; and, thirdly, the rational, in the brain:—a division which probably laid the foundation of the puerile doctrines of three animal spirits, taught in the Schools through twenty succeeding centuries.

There have been a few critical periods in the history of every science, when the advent of individual men revolutionized the entire subject. Such periods became, like the Hegira of Mahomet, new starting-points. Thus it was that Newton, Linnæus, John Hunter, Dalton, William Smith, and Cuvier, stirred up the dry bones of their respective subjects, and gave them life. One of these advents marked an era in Grecian history in the person of Aristotle. The son of a Court-Physician who in his day enjoyed some distinction as a writer on natural science, Aristotle obtained an excellent preliminary education, fitting him for his future labours: at the same time, he doubtless acquired from his father those tastes, which led him to court philosophy, and make her the mistress of his affections. In the second year of the 103rd Olympiad, (B.C. 367,) having lost his father, he came to Athens, where he remained twenty years. When he reached

the Attic metropolis, he was a youth of seventeen. Plato was then absent on his prolonged tour; but, on the return of the latter soon afterwards, when he taught in the gymnasium of the Academy, and in the shades of his own garden, Aristotle became one of his pupils, and soon attracted the eye of his teacher by his diligent zeal; needing a curb, according to Diogenes Laërtius. At a still later period, we find the rising philosopher surrounded by a circle of scholars, to whom he appears to have lectured on rhetoric and politics. His early association with the Court at Pella enabled him to establish a youthful friendship with Philip, the future Monarch of Macedon, important in its results to science. Eventually he left Athens to return to his native town, where, in the retirement of a pleasant grove, containing a gymnasium erected for him by his illustrious patron and friend, he educated Alexander, the future conqueror, along with other youths who rose to distinction and fame.

In B.C. 336, Alexander ascended the throne of his murdered father, and, during the subsequent year, Aristotle again removed to Athens, where the Lyceum was assigned to him, by the State, as a gymnasium. Thirteen years he spent in this peaceful retreat, lecturing to his pupils whilst wandering in the shady groves, and writing most of the works which have given his name its immortality. Both Philip and Alexander afforded him such an amount of aid in his zoological investigations as no other naturalist has ever enjoyed. They caused collections of natural objects to be made for him through their subordinate officers in every part of their vast dominions; and not only were the materials for research thus provided for him on an enormous scale, but Alexander aided him with a sum of 800 talents,\*—an instance of princely zeal for science which is without a parallel.

Most of the works on Natural History written by the Stagyrte remain, and are marvellous monuments of his intellectual acuteness and persevering industry. Several important books on Anatomy are unfortunately lost; some of which appear to have even been illustrated by drawings. This loss is to be regretted, since not only has Aristotle laid great stress on the importance of anatomical investigations to the Zoologist, but the accuracy of his remaining descriptions attests that he practised what he taught.

He divided the animal kingdom into two great sections; namely, those possessing blood, (that is, *red* blood,) and those possessing a colourless fluid, or *sanies*, instead of blood. The former of these divisions corresponds with that of the *Vertebrata* of modern naturalists, and the latter with that of the *Invertebrate* animals; thus not merely foreshadowing, but distinctly establishing, the great primary groups recognised by all modern

\* One of the smallest values assigned to the Attic talent is about £180 of our money, but it is generally regarded as equal to £243. 15s.

Zoologists. This circumstance alone demonstrates his possession of that power of generalization, which is the stamp and seal of genius. A similar evidence is afforded by his separation of the mammalian *Vertebrata* (that is, those which suckle their young) from the other four-footed tribes. These he denominated ζωοτόκα, or "viviparous" animals. The establishment of this class was in itself an evidence of his discernment; but that he should also include in it the anomalous *Cheiroptera*, or "bats," and the *Cetacea*, or "whales," and "porpoises," whose marine habits and fish-like forms bear so little resemblance to the ordinary mammalian quadrupeds, is one of those marvellous evidences of his discriminating power, which give him a place amongst the greatest philosophers the world has ever known.

But besides the proofs which these generalizations afford of the profoundly philosophic character of his mind, we have similar demonstrations that he possessed the opposite power of accurately noting minute details. We cannot illustrate this portion of his mental constitution better, than by quoting the language of Professor Owen:—

"In these several parts of his extraordinary work, Aristotle indicates nine different species of *Cephalopods*, (marine animals allied to the nautilus, or cuttle-fish,) with so much precision, and with so happy a selection of their distinctive characters, that modern naturalists have been enabled to identify almost all the species that were studied by the Stagyrte two thousand years ago.

"Of these we may first mention the *nautilus which adheres to its shell*, and which, we conceive, may have been the *Nautilus Pompilius*; second, the *nautilus which does not adhere to its shell*, universally allowed to be the *Argonauta*, or paper nautilus of the moderns; third, the cuttle-fish (*Sepia officinalis*); fourth and fifth, the great and small *Calamaries* (*Loligo vulgaris* and *Loligo media*); sixth and seventh, the great and small *Polyps*. The former is regarded by Belon and Rondeletius to have been the *Sepia Octopodia* of Linnæus; but the small species, which Aristotle states to have been variegated, has not yet been satisfactorily determined. Eighth, the *Bolitæna*, a genus of octopods, which Aristotle characterized by its peculiar odour. This is the *Eledona moschata* of Leach. Ninth, the *Eledone*, characterized by the single series of suckers, and to which the *Eledone cirrosa* of Leach corresponds. Respecting the living habits of the Cephalopods, Aristotle is more rich in details than any other zoological author; and Cuvier has observed that his knowledge of this class, both zoological and anatomical, is truly astonishing."—*Encyclop. Anat. and Physiol.*, Art. *Cephalopoda*.

A similar illustration is afforded by his description of the τεθρυν, a simple Ascidian mollusk, of anomalous character, and of which he has defined the anatomical and zoological peculiarities with remarkable accuracy.

On turning from Aristotle's knowledge of Comparative Anatomy, to the evidences afforded in his writings of his acquaint-

ance with the human frame, we find that, on some points, he is actually behind Hippocrates, and, on others, he has made no advance upon the knowledge of his illustrious predecessor. He did not distinguish between the veins: the name *ἀρτηρία* he gave to the windpipe, as Hippocrates had previously done; whilst that of *ἀορτή*, which the latter author has applied to the *bronchi*, or larger subdivisions of the windpipe, he assigned to the great trunk of the arterial system, which appellation the *aorta* has retained to the present day. Though, of course, ignorant of the circulation of the blood, he not only recognised that the pulsating power of the heart was inherent in the organ itself,—rather than dependent upon the respiratory act, as others had supposed,—but he discovered a fact with which modern anatomists are familiar,—that this pulsation is visible in the egg of the fowl, whilst the embryo is in an early stage of development. Indeed, Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation, appeals to the testimony of Aristotle on this point, in confirmation of his own more recent observations. He appears to have been acquainted with muscular action, though both he and Plato thought that the muscles, like fat or clothing, served to regulate the temperature, keeping out the heat in summer, and the cold in winter.

We cannot better convey to our readers an idea of Aristotle's crude and fanciful notions respecting the nervous system, than by quoting the following paragraph from Prochaska:—

"It is remarkable how widely Aristotle, with many others of the philosophers and Stoics, has erred in assigning a use for the brain, having described it as an inert *viscus*, cold and bloodless, an organ *sui generis*, not to be enumerated amongst the other organs of the body, seeing that it is of no use except to cool the heart. He then explained how the brain might be the refrigerator of the heart; inasmuch as vapours arise from the waters and earth, and, when they reach the cold middle region of the air, are condensed into water, which, falling upon the earth, cools it; so, also, the hot spirits carried from the heart to the brain, with the blood, and there being cooled, are condensed into water, which descends again to the heart for the purpose of cooling it. (*De Animal. Partib.*, lib. ii. cap. vii.) He placed the seat of the rational soul in the heart, where it can exercise all its functions; and he therefore made the nerves (of the use of which in sensation and motion he was not ignorant) to arise from the heart. This opinion of Aristotle, as to the heart being the seat of the soul, appears to be preserved even to our own days, in the popular modes of expression, as when a man of good disposition is said to have a good heart, and the writers on moral science speak of the cultivation of the heart."—*Dr. Laycock's Translation*, p. 365.

The inferiority of Aristotle's physiology, on this point, to that of Hippocrates, and even of Plato, is obvious, since they both connected the brain with the rational faculties as their instrument. He also denied what Hippocrates had affirmed,—that all the organs of sense centred in the brain. At the same time, he

separated the *voûs*, or reasoning faculty, from the remainder of the *ψυχή*, or common animating principle, which embodied the vital principle, the sensorial and intellectual faculties of modern writers.

Aristotle was succeeded at the Lyceum by the Eresian philosopher, Theophrastus, who supplemented the zoological labours of the Stagyrte, apparently standing in the same relation to him that Playfair did to Hutton, in more recent times. Most of his writings on Zoology are lost; but his zeal left a memorial behind, in the tastes and pursuits of the physician Erasistratus, who appears, from a remark in the writings of Galen, to have received a part of his education under the great Eresian.

Erasistratus lived during the third century before Christ. Were there nothing else to render him famous, he would be remembered as the luckiest physician on record, having received a hundred talents, or more than £24,000, in one fee, for curing Antiochus, the eldest son of Seleucus Nicator, King of Syria, of a fit of love-sickness, after a fashion that was as original as it was effective. He appears to have paid greater attention than most other ancient writers to anatomical studies. His works are chiefly lost, being only known from short extracts preserved in the writings of Galen, Cœlius Aurelianus, and others; but these extracts demonstrate how much more accurate was his knowledge of human Anatomy, especially on some points, than that of his predecessors. He appears to have distinguished veins from arteries; and to have been the first who ceased to speak of the windpipe as an *ἀρτηρία*, and assigned to it its present name of *τραχέια*. At the same time, by recognising the common origin of the veins and arteries in the heart, instead of tracing them to the liver, he did something towards diminishing the confusion existing in the minds of the ancients on this subject. But, unfortunately, he conceived that the arteries contained air, and not blood. He appears, at an early date, to have concluded, that there existed two classes of nerves,—one for sensation, and the other for motion; the former being, in his opinion, hollow, and springing from the investing membranes of the brain; and the other, from the brain itself: but he ultimately satisfied himself, that they all sprang from the substance of the brain, and not from its membranes. We owe to him the employment of the term "*parenchyma*," as applied to the substance of a gland, being used by him in connexion with the liver. Respiration he regarded as designed to fill the arteries with air, through the *tracheia*, or "windpipe;" whence he supposed it to enter the vessels, and to be distributed throughout the body, the veins alone containing the blood. Here, again, the non-professional reader requires a word of explanation, to prevent him from accusing these ancients of stupid folly, which the exhibition of notions like the one just enunciated may tempt him to do.



The walls of the arteries are highly elastic, owing to which property they retain their cylindrical form after death. But they are very rarely found, on dissection, to contain blood, that element having chiefly passed through the minute capillaries, and accumulated in the non-elastic veins. When the ancients examined the dead body, and found these arterial tubes to contain nothing but air, they not unnaturally concluded that this *πνεῦμα*, or spiritual essence, was the element they were destined to diffuse through the body. Hence the way in which various "spirits" became mixed up with their physiological speculations. Erasistratus thought that an animal spirit emanated from the head, and a vital one from the heart.

Apparently contemporary with Erasistratus was Herophilus, a native of Chalcedon, but who afterwards became one of the founders of the Alexandrian School of Medicine; and also Philotinus, his fellow-pupil. Herophilus seems to have distinguished between nerves of sensation and those of motion, and introduced into anatomical technology several terms, such as *Torcular Herophili*, *Calamus scriptorius*, and *Duodenum*; names still retained in modern anatomical works. Philotinus, according to Galen, declared that the brain was only an excessive excrescence from the spinal marrow, which, as well as the heart, was of no use!

From the time of Erasistratus, a long interval occurred, in which no new discoveries were made, and no anatomists of distinction appeared. Various medical schools were in existence, that of Alexandria being the most celebrated; but they only taught the doctrines of those whom they recognised as their masters, and whose ideas they appear to have adopted in a way unfavourable to the progress of truth. More attention also was probably paid to the study of Medicine than of Anatomy, either human or comparative. One name alone stands out in strong relief during the long interval of more than three centuries, which intervened between the age of Erasistratus and the birth of Galen. It is that of the Elder Pliny, who was born A.D. 22.

His large work on Natural History, which still remains, exhibits this celebrated writer as a most diligent, yet credulous, collector of zoological facts. But of the philosophic spirit which breathes through the writings of Aristotle, no traces are to be found. Hence he entertained no just idea of the importance of anatomical inquiries, as the only sound basis for his studies. Marvellous and incredible tales had more charms for him than dissections: hence his works exhibit a wonderful sprinkling of winged horses, live tritons, animals without joints in their legs; others compounded of the stag, boar, horse, and elephant, reminding us of the fossil *Macrauchenia* and *Torodons* of America, which might have been created to perplex comparative

anatomists as to the zoological shelf they ought to occupy. A part of the eleventh book of his work is devoted to anatomical considerations; but it contains little that is either creditable to Pliny, or useful to science. He makes some notable generalizations; such as, that all living creatures whatsoever, having blood, have heads,—that man is the only animal that cannot wag his ears,—and that birds have neither veins nor arteries. He considers the heart as “the very seat of the mind and soul;” he speaks of the arteries as “the passages of the spirit and life,” whilst the veins are “the very conduits that carry the blood.” He tells us that “the arteries want sense; and no marvel, because they are without blood;” but of the brain he observes, “It is the fort and castle of all the senses; unto it all the veins from the heart do tend; in it they all do likewise end; it is the very highest keep, watch-tower, and sentinel of the mind; it is the helm and rudder of intelligence and good understanding,”—a statement difficult to reconcile with his previous declaration respecting the heart, and its spiritual tenant. He cannot be regarded as a philosophic naturalist; but as a diligent collector of facts and fictions, who was not over nice as to their value or probability.

The birth of Galen, A.D. 130, constitutes another of those critical periods in the history of science, to which reference has already been made. A native of Pergamos, he studied in the Schools of Smyrna, Corinth, and Alexandria. In his twenty-ninth year, he returned to Pergamos, where he practised as a physician until his thirty-fourth year, when political disturbances led him to leave his native place, and visit Rome. Here, with occasional interruptions, a considerable portion of his subsequent life was spent in teaching, and practising medicine; attending, amongst others, the Emperors M. Aurelius, Commodus, and S. Severus.

It is evident that Galen was a diligent dissector; but, owing to the prejudices still prevalent, it was the lower animals, rather than the human subject, upon which he principally employed his scalpel. Some of his descriptions have obviously been drawn from apes, especially those of the skeleton. We have already referred to one passage in his writings, in which he speaks of the great advantages enjoyed, in this matter, by his professional brethren who accompanied the imperial troops in their German campaigns; nevertheless he made great advances in anatomical knowledge. That he did not progress still further, becomes only intelligible when we duly estimate the power of educational prejudices in biassing the judgment, and blinding the eyes. The old spiritual philosophy had taken deep root in his mind, and the incubus was never cast off.

In his study of general physiology, Galen appears to have obtained a glimpse of distinctions which are now generally

recognised. The vital functions are capable of being divided into those of vegetative, or organic, life, and those of animal life; comprehending, under the former term, such as are concerned in the construction and nutrition of the individual, and the perpetuation of the species; and under the latter, the higher functions connected with consciousness, the operations of the senses, and the exercise of the will. May there not be the germ of something approaching to this idea, in Galen's supposition,—so long afterwards the favourite doctrine of the Schools,—that there are three kinds of immaterial existence in man's bodily frame; namely, the nutritive, of which the liver is the source; the vital, of which the heart is the source; and the rational, which emanates from the brain? But he has buried this approximation to modern philosophy—if such it can be regarded—under so heavy a load of hypothetical powers and humours, in accordance with the prevalent opinions of his predecessors, that the truth bears about the same proportion to the error, that Falstaff's pennyworth of bread did to the gallon of sack.

He enunciates a still more important principle, when he affirms that all the solid elements which enter into the composition of the body, are directly derived from the blood, thus recognising the protoplasmic character of the circulating fluid now universally admitted to be its essential feature.

Like his predecessors, Galen regarded the liver as the great organ of sanguinification. He thoroughly understood the distribution of the portal vein, with its two sets of branches. He also observed the *lacteals*, or "absorbent vessels," specially designed to take up the nutrient portion of the food, and convey it into the general circulation; but he did not distinguish them from the veins, of which he thought them to be a peculiar group, destined to nourish the intestines themselves. Having overlooked the fundamental distinction between these two sets of vessels, all the rest of his physiology became erroneous. He thought that the visceral branches of the portal vein, now known as the *mesenteric* veins, took up the nutriment from the digested food, and conveyed it to the liver; in flowing through which it was converted into blood. Here he supposed it to be taken up by a second set of veins, (the true *hepatic* veins,) which separated into two main trunks; one of which ascended to the upper part of the body, and the other descended towards the lower extremity; the two, combined, diffusing the blood through the system. Even the non-professional reader can now detect the admixture of truth and error in this hypothesis. The impure venous blood, returning from the alimentary canal, pursues a course towards and through the liver, very similar to that described by Galen; whilst in the liver it is transferred, through a network of minute vessels, into the *hepatic*, or true vein of the liver, which re-conducts it out of that organ into the great venous trunk of

the body, which it enters near its junction with the heart. Here Galen's radical error commenced. He reversed the true motion of the blood; and, instead of recognising its course as flowing into the heart, he supposed that it passed by that centre of the vascular system, and was dispersed through the body by the veins, one branch of which alone entered the heart.

He concluded that in all air-breathing animals the heart contained the same number of cavities, which he supposed to be two. The importance of the auricles, which constitute the two additional cavities of the quadripartite heart, was not recognised by him, since he merely regarded them as appendages to the organ. He had evidently not seen the reptilian heart, in which there is but one ventricular cavity. All the valves of the heart, and several of the large vessels proceeding from it, are described with great accuracy. He also observed the strength and sinuous arrangement of the fibres of the heart, but denied their muscularity. He distinguished between the arteries and the veins; and whilst he admitted that the former contained *some* air, he demonstrated that they contained blood in large quantities; recognising also the pulsation of the heart as the cause of that in the arteries, and the existence of the minute capillary vessels, forming the *anastomoses*, or terminal communications between the arteries and the veins. The general conclusion which he deduced from all this was, that there are two kinds of blood in the body,—the one thick and heavy, transmitted through *thin* veins, adapted to allow organs needing thick blood to attract it; and the other thin and spirituous, flowing through *thick* arteries, through the walls of which, owing to its spirituous nature, the arterial fluid could transude. The heart was compared by him to a stove, which eliminated heat to warm the body; and the object of respiration was the moderation of this heat. The respiratory process he considered to be of a two-fold character. In the one, air was admitted to the arteries through the lungs, and, in the other, through the skin; the diaphragm, or transverse muscle separating the thoracic from the abdominal cavity, being regarded as the principal instrument in effecting the pulmonary respiration. He regarded as distinct the special respiration involved in the act of speaking, which he believed to be regulated by the two sets of small oblique muscles connecting contiguous ribs, of the importance of which muscles, with their action in contracting the chest, he appears to have been the first observer.

He possessed an accurate idea of the action of the muscles upon the bones and joints, as in locomotion; whilst, as was remarked by the late Dr. Kidd, "to give a detailed account of Galen's osteology, would be almost the same as repeating the treatise of any modern writer on that subject."

In his views respecting the nervous system, we have an admix-

ture of truth and error, similar to those already recorded; but here the true predominates over the false. The brain is identified by him as the organ of the reasoning power; and he appears to have been somewhat of a phrenologist, since he recognises the connexion between a very small head and a deficiency of wits, though he does not allow that the opposite condition always obtains. His account of the origin and distribution of the nerves of the brain and spinal marrow displays an extraordinary amount of exact knowledge, extending even to an acquaintance with the phrenic, pneumogastric, and glosso-pharyngeal nerves; and, what is still more remarkable, he was familiar with their respective influences on respiration and speech. He supposed that, whatever power the nerves possessed, they derived from the brain, conveying sensation and the power of motion to all parts of the body. He conceived the existence of three classes of nerves: first, those presiding over sensation; second, those which regulate motion; and, third, a group distributed to several of the abdominal viscera, endowing those organs with the discriminative power of selecting or rejecting whatever might be beneficial or hurtful to the system.

Without entering further into a detailed account of the views of this remarkable man, we may observe, that the writings of no other ancient anatomist display such an amount of exact information, or indicate such a persevering use of the dissecting knife, at least amongst the lower vertebrate animals. But, with the exception of his description of the human skeleton, with which he would become familiar at the Alexandrian School, where it was habitually employed in the instruction of the students, the greater part of his knowledge belongs to the domain of Comparative, rather than Human, Anatomy.

Neither Galen, nor any of his predecessors, appears to have had a conception of those grand generalizations, as to the relations of organs and organisms to one another, the recent discoveries of which, in the hands of Oken and Vicq d'Azyr, Cuvier and Owen, have raised anatomical investigations to a high position in the scale of physical sciences. Their knowledge was detailed; but the details were insulated. Centuries had to roll away before the veil that obscured their vision was lifted up, and the anatomist became a philosopher.

A long and dreary void now occurs in the history of Anatomy, as well as of every other department of literature and science. The decay of the Roman Empire, and the succession of the Dark Ages, destroyed the spirit of inquiry which had produced such progressive results in the hands of Hippocrates and his successors. The times were not favourable to the consideration of such subjects. Men are esteemed great, in proportion to the degree in which they reflect the wants and tastes of an age; and the subjects of their investigations are appreciated in like man-



ner. Ordinary minds are content to sail with the stream, and to be merely the blind followers of accepted authorities. The genius and moral courage of a Harvey and a Hunter enabled them to burst through fetters that would have bound inferior men; but, in so doing, these heroes had to encounter a storm of obloquy and opposition, compared with which, showers of grape and exploding shrapnells are mere playthings. The contagious excitement afforded by companionship will sometimes enable a coward to charge a battery, and rush cheering up to the muzzles of its guns; but the man who would question, much more destroy, the fallacies which centuries have rendered sacred, who dares to tell a generation of sophists that both they and their ancestors have trod in a wrong path, that he alone has the internal light which will prove a truer guide, must prepare for a conflict of a different kind. The history of Harvey is a commentary on this subject,—envied, feared, ridiculed. Unlike most discoverers, he had the good fortune to see his philosophy established during his own life. But such men rarely enjoy this felicity. Their reputations must generally be left to receive justice from a more enlightened posterity.

Long after the death of Galen, the scientific world failed to exhibit men of this metal. Even that great anatomist was not free, according to Harvey, from some of the weakness just referred to. Harvey speaks of him as "not yielding implicitly to the truth, which it appears he could not help seeing, but rather being guided by caution lest he should offend the ancient physic." Subsequently to his time, the genius of the age delighted in logomachies and puerile subtleties. The man who could display the greatest skill in splitting hairs, carried off the honours of the day. Amidst this senseless war of words, a Harvey or a Hunter, a Cuvier or a Bell, would have failed to obtain a hearing. The intangible dogma of "animal spirits" better accorded with the tastes of the age, than the exact demonstrations of modern science would have done. Through the dismal interval of twelve centuries, the gloom of night rested upon the anatomical world; and though, here and there, a momentary gleam flashed across the sky, it was the coruscation of an aurora, and not the light of a planet. The professional intelligence of the age was subject to the authority of Galen and Aristotle; and men satisfied themselves, like the Chinese successors of Confucius, with expository illustrations and commentaries on the works of their illustrious masters.

The physical sky is said to be the darkest just before the dawn; but it is otherwise in the intellectual atmosphere. A twilight of inquiry gradually prepares the way for great changes. Luther was anticipated by the Bohemian martyrs, and Newton pioneered by the founders of the Royal Society. In like manner, when the sun of Harvey rose above the horizon, it found a

few planets in the darkened heavens,—attracting the gaze of men, but affording little light.

From the eighth to the twelfth centuries, anatomical science was chiefly cultivated by the Arabs, who, after the excitement of a career of military conquest, settled down to pursue the arts of civilization and peace. Such names as Rhazes and Avicenna, Avenzoar and Averroes, then stood high, as the Coopers, the Brodies, and the Clarkes of their day. But the Saracen Physicians paid little attention to Anatomy. The new science of Chemistry was springing into existence, and received much of their care, as evidenced by the numerous technical terms, *Alcohol*, *Al-kali*, &c., which indicate an Arab origin. *Materia Medica*, and descriptions of disease, bore a close relation to chemical science, and were equally favourite objects of study; but all these Saracen writers adopted the medical philosophy prevalent in the countries which their arms had subjugated, and became the devoted followers of Aristotle and Galen, whose doctrines were alike taught in the schools of Bagdad and of Spain.

The twelfth century, which witnessed the decline of the Arabic medical schools in the Peninsula, was succeeded by another dark period of three hundred years, in which anatomical science made little progress. The interval was not without great men in other departments of literature and science. Painting was reviving under Giotto and Giovanni Cimabue; Dante and Petrarch, Boccaccio and Chaucer, were adorning the realms of poetry; Benjamin of Tudela and Marco Polo were pioneering future travellers through distant regions. Piers Langtoft, Froissart, and Matthew of Westminster, became the progenitors of an illustrious race of historians. Robert de Sorbonne, and Walter de Merton, were bestirring themselves in the cause of education in Paris and Oxford. Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus were shaking the theological Schools to their centre; and even Natural Philosophy, though largely mingled with displays of the credulity of the age, was progressing in the hands of Raymond Lully, Flavio Giola, and Roger Bacon.

The thirteenth century witnessed the rise of the Universities of Bologna and Paris, followed, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, by medical schools in Vienna and most of the large Italian cities. To these schools the spirit of anatomical investigation was now transferred; and, in the sixteenth and subsequent centuries, they did vast service in producing a slow, but progressive, improvement in the character of the anatomical knowledge possessed by the members of the medical profession. One distinguished name alone occurs during the thirteenth century,—that of Moudini, who broke down the barrier of a deeply-rooted popular prejudice, by publicly dissecting two female sub-

jects at Bologna; and who published a very accurate description of the anatomy of the body, illustrated with anatomical plates. This striking work became the text-book of the Italian schools for three hundred years.

In the sixteenth century the slavish submission to the authority of Galen, which had so long held the anatomists in bondage, was thrown off by Vesalius. Of the extent of that submission some opinion may be formed from the conduct of Sylvius, who was the tutor of Vesalius at Paris. Sylvius, following the example of Bérenger of Carpi, substituted human bodies for pigs, on which the demonstrations of the lecture-room had been previously made, and, being a diligent student, he soon detected the inapplicability of Galen's descriptions to the demonstrations before his eyes; but, rather than admit that the descriptions were faulty, he preferred to conclude, that the examples before him were abnormal and accidental variations from the proper condition of the body; and when this did not suffice to explain the anomalies, he had recourse to the supposition, that, since the time when Galen wrote, the human frame had degenerated, and hence the discrepancies which he could not overlook! Strong, indeed, must have been the prejudices which could so distort the self-evident truth.

Vesalius was not the man to be held down by such narrow notions. He studied at Louvain and Paris, and afterwards lectured on Anatomy at Padua. The result of his investigations was the production of his celebrated work on the structure of the human body, which contained many truths diametrically opposed to the statements of Galen. He was familiar with the valves of the veins, several of which he discovered, the connexion of the *venæ cavæ* with the heart, the difference between veins and arteries, and the dependence of the circulation and the arterial pulse on the action of the heart, though mistaking the exact mode of its contraction. The blood he believed to advance and recede in the veins, according as it met with obstacles to its progress. He contended for the solidity of the partition separating the two ventricles of the heart, which Galen and his followers believed to be porous, transmitting blood from one side to the other. He recognised the inherent contractility of the muscular fibre, and the resemblance of the muscular tendons to ligaments; and rectified innumerable errors respecting the structure and position of the bones, brain, eye, *pleura*, and various *viscera* of the body. To attempt to enumerate all his discoveries in this department would require us to devote pages to the task. But not having recognised the course of the blood, he was still in bondage to Galen's hypothesis of the existence of "spirits," of which he believed the "animal" to be secreted in the ventricles of the brain, and the "vital" in the heart; the

latter being conducted with some blood through the arteries to the various parts of the body.\*

This assault by Vesalius on the canonized authority of Galen was only equalled in its effects by that made at a later date on the Philosophy of Aristotle, and the Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas. A host of opponents sprang up to rescue Galen from such unhallowed hands, amongst whom was Sylvius, the venerable preceptor of Vesalius. But it was all in vain; the spell of authority and *prestige* was broken; a free spirit of inquiry once more prevailed, and, notwithstanding his manifold errors and imperfections, Vesalius was triumphant.

Amongst those who contended for the doctrines of Galen, were Fallopian, the distinguished pupil of his opponent, and Eustachius, to whom belongs the merit of having united the study of Comparative Anatomy with that of the human frame,—a union which, as the discoveries of the nineteenth century have demonstrated, is essential to the elevation of Anatomy to the rank of a science. Fallopian gives us a hint in one of his works, as we are reminded by Sprengel, respecting the way in which they managed matters in those days, when Anatomy Bills had no existence, and “subjects” were scarce:—“*Lorsque les Anatomes manquaient des cadavres, ils priaient les Princes de leur accorder un criminel, qu'ils faisaient périr à leur manière, comme dit Fallope, c'est-à-dire, avec l'opium, et qu'ils disséquaient ensuite!*” †

There is yet one more illustrious name belonging to the sixteenth century, rarely identified with the progress of Anatomy, but whose writings display great knowledge of this science. It is that of Michael Servetus, the victim of Genevan intolerance. Servetus, like Vesalius, was satisfied that the blood could not pass from one side of the heart to the other through the septum; hence he concluded that it must proceed through the lungs, where it became charged with the vital spirit obtained from the atmospheric air. He also deduced, from the large size of the artery and veins going to the lungs, the philosophical conclusion, that these vessels must have some other function than that of merely nourishing those organs. He determined, besides, that the course of the blood just described was first pursued on the birth of the individual.

From the preceding observations it will be seen, that the sixteenth century presented the dawn of a brighter day for anatomical science. It is the glory of English anatomists, that the

---

\* Vesalius received assistance, in the production of his anatomical plates, from the pencil of Titian,—who thus familiarized himself with the human frame, as Leonardo da Vinci had previously done for Della Torre, the Professor at Padua and Pavia,—and Michel Angelo, who also devoted his attention to engraving anatomical plates; affording admirable lessons to modern artists respecting the foundation that must be laid, if they would win abiding fame as delineators of the human figure.

† Sprengel, *Hist. de Médecine*, tome iv., p. 15.

noon-day brightness of the subsequent age emanated from one of themselves. The small town of Folkestone, in Kent, is chiefly celebrated as a locality rich in the beautiful fossils with which its soft blue clay abounds; but in the medical world its claim to distinction rests on the fact, that it was the birth-place of the immortal Harvey.

The son of a gentleman in easy circumstances, and a mother who, according to an epitaph in Folkestone church, appears to have been a superior woman, Harvey obtained, in early life, the educational advantages which laid the foundation of his future greatness. After studying at Canterbury and Cambridge, he followed the custom of his age, and proceeded to the Continent to complete his medical studies, selecting the University of Padua as his *Alma Mater*. At that time, Jerome Fabricius, of Aquapendente, pupil and successor of Fallopius, held the Anatomical Chair; and, like his great teacher, drew largely from the resources afforded by Comparative Anatomy, in explaining and illustrating the functions of the human body. From Fabricius Harvey learnt the structure of the valves of the veins. On his return to England, where he became an eminently successful and flourishing practitioner, he devoted himself to the investigation of their uses; and in 1619 he first publicly enunciated his theory of the double circulation of the blood. Up to this time, the English Physicians were the unwavering followers of Galen, as the Italians had been prior to the rebellion of Vesalius. Conscious, doubtless, of the opposition which his new views would have to encounter, Harvey waited nine years after the true idea of the circulation suggested itself to his own mind, before promulgating it to the world; experimenting, meanwhile, so satisfactorily, as to place his theory in a position to defy dispute. But, notwithstanding the clearness of his proofs, on the first announcement of the doctrine, it was universally rejected by those who held the highest rank as anatomical teachers. Even those who were disposed to admit the fallacy of the hypotheses of Galen, could not but believe that there were two kinds of blood in the body,—the one, dark-coloured and thick, flowing in the veins; and the other, bright and red, contained in the arteries. One of Harvey's fundamental propositions was the unity of the blood. His opponents, obliged to admit some movement in the fluid, supposed, as their predecessors had done, that the two fluids commingled through imaginary apertures in the septum of the heart, as Galen had suggested. Harvey demonstrated, in the most conclusive manner, that no such orifices existed; and that the connexion between the contents of the arteries and the veins must be through minute terminal vessels which united the two. These vessels were never seen by Harvey, but he inferred their presence; the correctness of the inference being demonstrated by



Malpighi a few years later. That such a communication existed, was a part of the philosophy of Galen and his school, though they were ignorant of its significance and purport.

The universal opposition which the Harveyan doctrine at first encountered, gradually died away, as advocates for its truth sprang up, chiefly from amongst the younger members of the profession. But this was no sudden result. The progress of truth was slow, but sure. Meanwhile, Harvey was paying the penalty of an innovator. Like John Hunter at a later date, he was howled at by a pack of self-sufficient sciolists, who, unhappily, had it in their power to make the immortal discoverer feel their influence. The story is one alike humiliating to the profession and to our common humanity. On the appearance of his book, Aubrey tells us that "he fell mightily in his practice; it was believed by the vulgar that he was crack-brained; and all the Physitians were against him." Dr. Willis observes, on this subject,—

"So it has mostly been with those who have added to the sum of human knowledge! The empiric, under the title of the 'practical man,' in his unsuspecting ignorance, sets himself up, and is admitted as an arbiter wherever there is difficulty: blind himself, he leads the blinded multitude the way he lists. He who laid the foundation of modern medical science, lost his practice for his pains; and the routineer, with an appropriate salve for every sore, a pill and potion for each particular ache and ail, would not give threepence for one of his prescriptions! \* did not admire his therapeutique way!! and could not tell what he did aim at!!! Ignorance and presumption have never hesitated to rend the veil that science and modesty, all in supplying the means, have still owned their inability to raise. If Harvey faltered, who of his contemporaries could rightly presume to walk secure? And yet did each and all of them, unconscious of the darkness, tread their twilight paths assuredly; whilst he, the divinity among them, with his eyes unsealed, felt little certain of his way. So it has still been with medicine; and the world must make many a lusty onward stride in knowledge before it can be otherwise."—*Life of Harvey*, (Sydenham Society's Edition of Harvey's Works,) p. xxiv.

Whilst Harvey was maturing his theory of the circulation, other observers were investigating the vessels known as "lac-teals" and "absorbents." The former of these take up the nutritious elements of the food from the intestines, whilst the latter take up in succession all the atoms of the body, playing their part in that incessantly active process of absorption and deposition, which, in a few years, leaves to a man nothing of his former self. The numerous small branches of these vessels,

\* "Aubrey had recorded, 'Though all his profession would allow him to be an excellent anatomist, I never heard any that admired his therapeutique way. I knew several practitioners in this town that would not have given threepence for one of his bills (prescriptions), and (who said) that a man could hardly tell by his bills what he did aim at.'"—*Lives of Eminent Persons*, 8vo. London, 1813.

which spring from the abdominal *viscera* and from the lower extremities, unite to form the *thoracic duct*, or main trunk which conveys the absorbed elements in a fluid state to the point where the veins of the left arm and side of the neck meet, and where this fluid enters the general circulation. This duct was first discovered by Eustachius, a Professor at Rome, and Physician to Cardinal d'Urbino; but he was ignorant of its functions. In 1622, Asselli, a Professor at Pavia, discovered the lacteals which absorb the chyle, or nutritious product of digestion, from the intestines. His attention was drawn to them, whilst dissecting a dog, by the white colour of their contents. He erred as to their destination, tracing them, as he thought, first to the pancreas, and afterwards to the liver, being biassed by the old notion that the liver was the great organ of sanguification. In 1641, Hoffman of Brandenburg, and Wirsung, a Bavarian, found the true excretory duct of the pancreas opening into the bowel; and Bartholin, of Copenhagen, at the same time recognised its function; thus removing one cause of obscurity respecting the nature of the lacteal vessels. In 1647, Jean Pecquet, of Dieppe, but residing at Montpellier, re-discovered in a dog the *thoracic duct*, previously seen, but not comprehended, by Eustachius; and, what was important, he traced its connexion at its lower extremity with the lacteals of Asselli; whilst, at its upper end, he observed its junction with the veins of the left arm and left side of the neck, where they unite to form a common trunk, conveying the blood back to the heart. This most important discovery was followed, in 1651, by that of the lymphatic or absorbent vessels, which are distributed, not merely to the intestines, but throughout the body, where they take up the effete matter, but which chiefly empty themselves, as do the lacteals, into the *thoracic duct*. The distinction between these two sets of vessels was first made by Olaus Rudbeck, a youth of twenty-one, who subsequently became a Professor at Upsala. It is somewhat painful to find the enlightened discoverer of the circulation of the blood rejecting these brilliant discoveries of Rudbeck, Pecquet, and Asselli, in a spirit more worthy of his own unreasonable opponents than of himself.

Equally important discoveries were now made respecting the structure and functions of the lungs. At this early period the results of the examination of atmospheric air by Lavoisier and Priestley were, of course, unknown; but though the actual characters and properties of oxygen were not understood, Bathurst, Henshaw, and Mayow had ascertained some of its properties. Mayow, especially, concluded that one of the elements composing the atmosphere acted upon the blood in the lungs, and that the gas which did so was the one that supported ordinary combustion. He also pointed out the great probability that this unknown element had been in some degree comprehended by some of the ancient physiologists, and indicated by them under

the vague, but common, designation of "vital spirit." Prior to this period, the followers of Galen supposed that the air-tubes of the lungs were continuous with the arteries, and that the air was thus transmitted through the respiratory organs to these latter vessels. But Malpighi, a Professor of Medicine at Bologna and Messina, Hooke, the Secretary to the rising Royal Society of London, and several other anatomists, ascertained, with substantial accuracy, the relation between the air-tubes and the pulmonary blood-vessels, demonstrating the absence of all continuity between them.

It is remarkable how lively an interest in anatomical investigations was excited in the minds of our countrymen during this fertile period. Much of this was unquestionably due to the active efforts of the Royal Society of London. Its Fellows obtained from Charles II. a grant of the bodies of all criminals executed at Tyburn, and claimed the rights thus delegated to them. Whenever a dissection was about to take place, the announcement was made to all the Fellows. The advantages which the members of the Society enjoyed through these public dissections, were not confined to them, but indirectly benefited others less favourably situated, and stimulated them to the pursuit of similar inquiries,—not the least of the many benefits which we owe to that venerable, but still vigorous, institution.

Willis—also a F.R.S., and Professor at Oxford—now contributed largely to the stock of knowledge respecting the structure and functions of the nervous system, and at the same time made a most important contribution to Comparative Anatomy, by devoting a chapter in one of his works to the structure and zoology of the lower animals. The instinctive powers of animals he attributed to an *anima*, or "corporeal soul," seated in the *cerebellum*, distinguishing this from the *animus*, or "intellectual soul," situated in the *cerebrum* or "true brain,"—an opinion which modern science has not confirmed. But in demonstrating the existence of psychological distinctions, and in the assignment of particular functions to special parts of the brain, he opened out a new field for investigation, and established his reputation as the first anatomist of his day.

During the seventeenth century, the organs of sense attracted much attention, especially the eye. Kepler, the astronomer, studied the crystalline lens, and demonstrated that it was merely an instrument for refracting the rays of light, and not, as previously thought, the true organ of vision. This important demonstration was further illustrated by the Jesuit Scheiner, a resident at the Court of the German Emperor Matthias. He not only established the different refracting powers of the various humours, &c., in the eye, but also the motion of the pupil, the

dependence of the visual power on the retina as its true organ, and the approximation or recession of the crystalline lens to and from the retina, accommodating the eye to the differing distances of the objects looked at. Descartes contributed something to the elucidation of the same subject, whilst Fabricius de Peyresce, of Aix in Provence, devoted most of his time to the study of the comparative anatomy of this organ, in which study he was followed by Dr. Briggs, one of the Physicians to St. Thomas's Hospital, London, who discovered the sphericity of the crystalline lens in the fish, and the relation of its form and consequent high refracting power, to the dense watery medium in which these animals live. At the commencement of the seventeenth century, the anatomy of the ear attracted the attention of Jules Casserius, a Professor at Padua, who made Comparative Anatomy subservient to his investigations on that organ in man, many portions of which he described with considerable accuracy. He was followed by several others, especially Cecile Folius, Manfrede of Rome, Perrault, who, like Casserius, availed himself of his knowledge of Comparative Anatomy, even to a greater extent than the Paduan *savant*; and especially Joseph Guischart Duverney, Professor of Anatomy at the *Jardin des Plantes*, in Paris, who contributed more than any of his predecessors to an exact knowledge of this intricate organ. He especially discovered that the function of the Eustachian tube was to convey air from the pharynx to the interior of the organ, causing it to act on the principle of a drum. Raymond Vieussens, a Professor at Montpellier, and Amboine Valsalva, still further perfected the history of the ear.

Towards the end of the century, one of the greatest naturalists that ever lived, was working, in comparative obscurity, at Delft, and laying the foundation of a revolution destined to place all the natural sciences, but especially Anatomy, in an entirely new position. On April 29th, 1673, we find Regnier de Graaf, a distinguished Physician and anatomist of Delft, writing to Oldenberg, one of the Secretaries to the Royal Society, and first editor of the "Philosophical Transactions," that "one Mr. Leuwenhoeck hath lately contrived microscopes excelling those that have hitherto been made;" and along with this letter was sent the first communication from Leuwenhoeck to the Royal Society, describing the structure of a bee and a louse. This was followed by a series of additional communications, three hundred and seventy-four in number, of which no less than one hundred and twenty-five Memoirs were printed in the "Philosophical Transactions." The reputation which he enjoyed may be estimated by the high compliment addressed to him by a classic of his day, the justice of which was recognised by the entire scientific world:—

*"Rursus apud Batavos fundunt oracula Delphi;  
Hic habitat Phæbus, Græcia muta jacet.  
Hic habitat Phæbus; non iste per ora Sibyllæ  
Doctus apud vanos non nisi vana loqui:  
Clarior et melior; solidas qui condidit artes,  
Delphos ingenii fertilitate beat."*

Leuwenhoeck seems to have been the first who appreciated the significance of the blood-globules. These were primarily seen by Malpighi; but the Bolognese Professor does not appear to have rightly estimated the importance of his own discovery. The Dutch philosopher, who also detected them by an independent observation, gave them the prominence they deserved. At a later period, (1690,) he made the still more brilliant discovery that, by means of his wondrous instrument, he could demonstrate the truth of the Harveyan theory of the circulation of the blood, by revealing its actual course and motion in the foot of the frog, and in the fins of fishes. He examined the structure of muscle, recognising its elementary fibres, as well as the ultimate *fibrillæ* into which each fibre can be resolved. He observed that the fibres of some muscles—which we now know to be those termed "*voluntary*," or subject to the control of the will, in contradistinction to those which, like the heart, are incapable of being so influenced—were marked by numerous transverse *striæ*. Hooke had previously obtained a glimpse of this structure; but the observations of both these *savans* were overlooked until 1741 and 1781, when Muys and Fontana again detected them, and even pointed out their value in distinguishing between voluntary and involuntary muscular fibre: but, by a strange fatality, these results were again lost sight of, until the facts were re-discovered by Dr. Hodgkin and Mr. Lister, in 1832. Like Dr. Martin Barry at the present day, Leuwenhoeck thought that these *striæ* were due to a spiral thread wound round the fibre, and to which he supposed the contractile power of the muscle was due; an hypothesis which has now few advocates. The numerous animalcules abounding in water attracted the attention of Leuwenhoeck at an early period; and he noted the peculiar *ciliæ*, or delicate filaments, with which various parts of their bodies are covered, and which constitute their locomotive organs,—his being, apparently, the first observations made on this important subject. In addition to these researches, the structure of teeth, bone, hairs, nervous substance, *epithelium*, as well as the phenomena of animal generation, were made matters of inquiry, along with a variety of less important topics; and, though his communications are replete with errors,—such, for example, as concluding hair, grey nervous matter, and other cellular tissues to be mere aggregations of the globules which he had found in the blood,—he must still be regarded as the great founder of histological science. Strange it is that a century and



a half had to elapse before an isolated professorship could be established for the teaching of the revelations of the microscope, notwithstanding the magnificent demonstrations of its value afforded thus early by the labours of one persevering man.

It is impossible to glance at the early volumes of the "Philosophical Transactions," and not to be struck with the importance which Comparative Anatomy was rapidly acquiring towards the close of the seventeenth century. Prior to this period, with the exception of the Works of Aristotle, its study had only borne the same relation to that of Human Anatomy which landscape-painting did to the delineation of the human form. It was accessory and illustrative, rather than the primary object of inquiry. The case was now altered. Martin Lister, a Physician of York, afterwards medical attendant upon Queen Anne, was investigating the structure of shells and insects; Ray, the son of a blacksmith,—who raised himself, not only to a fellowship, but to a succession of varied lectureships in Trinity College, and who nobly sacrificed all his collegiate privileges, rather than sign a Declaration against the Solemn League and Covenant,—was ranging through every department of animate nature; Willoughby, his pupil, though cut off at the early age of thirty-seven, lived long enough to become a leading ornithologist and the father of ichthyological science; Swammerdam, of Amsterdam, a distinguished *alumnus* of Leyden, the discoverer of the art of injecting blood-vessels with wax, was elucidating the anatomy of insects; Edward Tyson, one of the Lecturers to the Gresham College, was studying the *mammalia* and worms: whilst a host of such men as Peyer, of Schaffhausen; Plot, the historian of Oxfordshire, and first Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum; Bartholin of Copenhagen, the discoverer, along with Rudbeck, of the lymphatic vessels; Malpighi, the author of a laborious work on the Silkworm,—a masterly specimen of an anatomical monograph; and Aldrovandus, of Bologna, whose zeal for his pursuits led to the ruin of his ample fortunes, and his melancholy death in a hospital; were engaged on important inquiries into the structure of the animal kingdom, and rapidly extending the boundaries of Comparative Anatomy. To dwell upon the special results obtained by these distinguished men would require volumes to be written; consequently, the limits of this article only admit of a general indication of the fields in which they respectively laboured.

We have now brought our anatomical sketch to the close of one of the most remarkable centuries in the history of the world; remarkable alike for its material additions to the domain of knowledge, and for the introduction of improved instruments adapted to the further extension of scientific inquiry. Its opening year found Bacon in the maturity of manhood; and the subsequent appearance of the *Novum Organum*, and of the "Advancement of Learning," constituted the birth of true philosophy. Napier,

Gassendi, and Boyle, contributed their respective portions towards the foundation of a glorious superstructure. Huygens, Galileo, and Kepler, by their success in improving the telescope and its applications, raised astronomical science to a position which prepared the way for the subsequent labours of Newton. Shakspeare and Ben Jonson placed the drama on the loftiest pinnacle which it was ever destined to occupy. Milton and Dryden, Corneille, Molière, and Racine, shone like a galaxy of stars in the realms of poetry. Purcell in music, Inigo Jones and Christopher Wren in architecture, and Locke in the philosophy of human thought, alike occupied the positions of masters in their respective departments. In the studios of painters, when was such an assemblage of names witnessed in close conjunction, as Rubens and Guido Rheni, Vandyke and Claude Lorraine, Rembrandt and Murillo, Carlo Dolce and Salvator Rosa? At the same time, deep social problems were being solved, and the troubled sea of human passion was disturbed by the most exciting themes. The Church of Christ was still the scene of conflicts only equalled by those which ushered in the Lutheran Reformation. The rich eloquence of Butler and Jeremy Taylor, of Baxter, Barrow, and Stillingfleet, was developing, in the minds of the people, that appreciation of true religion which soon bore such saving fruit. The pilgrim-fathers, and their immortal companions, demonstrated to spiritual despots, how much privation sanctified hearts would encounter, rather than sacrifice their religious liberties; whilst Russell, Sidney, and Hampden gave us civil freedom, receiving, as their reward, the martyr's grave. With all its imperfections, it was a glorious century; an age of genius and human greatness, in which the difficulties that arrested the onward-course of men, only called forth resources which, in more peaceful times, would have been buried under the incubus of social ease. True it is, that gentle meandering rills are richer instruments of fertilization than the impetuous mountain torrent, which can only nourish through its chance-directed spray. Where obstacles have to be overcome, and barriers broken down, those divided rills are powerless; to accomplish their purpose, they must unite their streams in a wide-spread lake, whose glassy surface indicates tranquillity and peace. But within the bosom of those gathering waters, there slumbers a mighty force, which, when the set time arrives, will be roused into terrible action, sweeping before it every impediment that nature or art has put in its way. So it was in the seventeenth century. Every branch of scientific inquiry, and every social and political problem, approached their solution with a rapidity which presented a mighty contrast to the comparative quietude of preceding centuries. The western world emerged from the torpidity of a chrysalis state to the restless and active condition of the perfected insect. But, instead of the ephemeral existence of the fluttering butterfly, that condi-

tion has proved to be one of perennial life, in which each year has developed new powers and new resources.

We cannot now even glance at the rich intellectual harvests that have been reaped in this department of science during the last hundred and fifty years. We must reserve this task to some future occasion. But in no branch of inquiry have more beautiful revelations of order and law been demonstrated than in the regions of Comparative Anatomy. Unfortunately, the love of exciting the wondering stare has led men to overstep the boundaries of truth on this subject, and to announce that such was the perfection to which this science had attained, that from the merest fragment of a bone men could re-construct the entire animal to which it had belonged. That this is arrant nonsense, as false as it is mischievous, the long catalogue of gross errors, that have been committed by the most distinguished men, will amply testify. Reptiles have been mistaken for birds and for mammalia; fishes have been confounded with reptiles; and fragments of crabs have been mistaken for fishes. The science needs no such meretricious statements as have been made from public platforms to gaping audiences: isolated phenomena are now taking their places, and a knowledge of their mutual relationships is in process of rapid attainment. Enough has already been done to show that the orbs of heaven are not more under the dominion of law, or their motions more conformable to a common order, than are the diversified organizations of the animal kingdom to elementary types. The early anatomists knew nothing of these truths; their discovery is one of the glories of the present day.

ART. V.—1. *The Poetical Works of James Russell Lowell.* Edited by ANDREW R. SCOBLE. London: George Routledge and Co. 1852.

2. *The Golden Legend.* By H. W. LONGFELLOW. Second Edition. London: David Bogue. 1852.

3. *The Poetical Works of Edgar Allan Poe.* London: Addey and Co. 1853.

4. *Poe's Tales of Mystery and Imagination; and Poems.* First and Second Series. London: Clarke, Beeton, and Co. 1852.

HOWEVER opinion may vary as to the comparative merits of our present poets and those of other times, it will on all sides be admitted that the æsthetic principles, upon which poetry itself is based, are now much more generally understood than at any former period. It is a mistake to define poetry merely as an art. It is such only in the endless instances of its application to practice. But in its dependence upon principles of human

nature, rather than upon rules,—in its existence antecedent to, not springing from, experience,—it partakes of the nature of a science. While, therefore, as an art, it may multiply its productions to infinity, it is yet confined within certain canons, never to be transgressed with impunity. It is of late years only that these have been investigated with any degree of precision,—that criticism, the philosophy of aesthetics, has been properly cultivated. What a difference is there between the frigid analysis of Addison, and the genial penetration of Coleridge or Hazlitt! And, as Hallam says, the papers on “Paradise Lost,” in the “Spectator,” were an immense advance on every thing that had preceded them.

But we are far from agreeing with the superficial doctrine, that, in the more cultivated ages, in which philosophy is studied, great poets must necessarily disappear; that is to say, that the scientific apprehension of the laws of poetry interferes with the *abandon* of the genuine artist,—an assertion contrary both to analogy and experience. Modern ingenuity, for instance, has discovered that the sculptors of ancient Greece were in possession of a harmonic ratio of form, analogous to the diatonic scale in music. But is the majesty of a Greek statue diminished by this? or was the soul of the sculptor cramped? No: a conscientious adherence to this general law, not less than individual genius, has produced that exquisite proportion and grace, after which later imitation has laboured in vain; and has moreover developed a universal of beauty, which, despite the bias of race or clime, is acknowledged by all. We do not, of course, claim for critical laws and principles the power of creating the poet. They are drawn from previously-existing art; and their evolution has been simultaneous with the discovery that to apply them belongs to genius alone. But their influence in the guidance of genius is incalculable. It is both the defect and the praise of poetry to become the “mirror of the age.” How many instances are there upon record of men, richly endowed with “the faculty divine,” whose writings are faulty, obscure, and nearly worthless, through their too great subservience to the fashions of the time! A constant remembrance of the high requisitions of poetry, an assurance that its eternal principles are swaying the public mind, is likely to save the poet from a vast amount of aberration, and is doubtless the cause of the almost perfect taste which distinguishes much of the genuine poetry of this age. The influence of a defective criticism—that is, of a low-toned reading public—was well evidenced in the feebleness of the “Muses” of the latter half of the eighteenth century. It is precisely where criticism ceases to be a science, ceases to take cognizance of definite principles, and becomes referable only to individual taste, that poetry loses its verisimilitude, becomes frigid,—a mere illustration of empiric rules.

There is a somewhat similar sense in which criticism—the appreciation of things—affects poetry. We constantly observe in poetry, as in other things, men of very different powers united in the contemplation of a set of truths or opinions. The change which began at the commencement of the current century in the character of English poetry, and the struggle between the antiquated school and the promulgators of a new order of things, have of late been made the subject of frequent disquisition. But we have never yet seen any thing connecting, by a law of causation, the phases through which poetry, since her emancipation from the old *régime*, has successively passed. We think that a clue may be found in the contemporary history of mental philosophy. It is a patent fact, that the French Revolution owed its origin, in great measure, to the rationalistic theories of the day; and the revival of poetry was coincident with that event. What have been the subsequent stages of the progress of mental philosophy? Speaking generally, they are two,—the French and the German. The one, starting with the rejection of reason, and setting up sensation alone as the criterion of truth, returned eventually to reason, and denied the super-sensual, thus tending to atheism. The other, with the same premiss,—the incompetence of reason to attain a knowledge of the super-sensual,—arrived at the opposite conclusion; and, instead of denying the existence of the latter, argued for it from the subjective consciousness of faith. This is the Pantheistic phase. Seldom, in Germany at least, has the chain of argument been completed,—the inference drawn, of the necessity of a revelation to meet the vague cravings of faith, or the adaptation of the Christian scheme to all these wants acknowledged. All creeds have been regarded as alike,—mere symbols and effects of a mental phenomenon; and often an absolute deification of nature, as being herself the great corresponding object of human ideas, has been the result. How do the developments of English poetry answer to these phases? The latter of them, from the very nature of poetry, has been productive of the greater effect; indeed, Byron is the only instance of a great poet of thoroughly atheistic tendency. He is one of the very few who have remained poets in spite of their wit. There are not many instances of aberration on the opposite score. Germanism in Germany is a very different thing from Germanism in England; many causes, such as the spirit and training of the people, combine to check and temper its influence. Its most noticeable effect on poetry has been the large infusion of the subjective element. This has placed poetry upon its proper footing, and created between our poets and those of the best ages a marked generic resemblance. Nothing is more certain than that poetry, in the highest sense, is the expression of the eternal union and reciprocity existing between the soul and external beauty. Nature, in



this view, appears in her proper sphere, as the creatrix of sensation, and the ultimate suggester of thought: nor should she ever have usurped any other place; she is but the robe, which, however gorgeous, is yet ennobled by the form about which it is cast. It has, then, been perceived that, as the beauty of form and colour exist only in and through human intuition, the analysis of the latter should always be understood and implied in every delineation of the former. This analysis is effected by thought, which is defined to be "the representative of past emotion." So that poetry, to borrow the language of metaphysics, deals not with presentative, but with representative, faculties; not with intuition, but imagination. It is like the mirror of the Egyptian necromancer, which showed only phantoms.

This is the great lesson which poetry has received from the deep thinkers of Germany, and from the German-like thinkers of this country. Its own nature, demanding a due admixture of objectivity, a recognition of matter as well as of mind, has generally preserved it from the excesses of absolutism: it is nearer to perfection, as the alternation between "the outward and the inward" is better observed. So long as this principle is recognised, our poets are safe from the errors of their predecessors. There will be no danger of a poem being either an allegory, or a treatise on landscape gardening. No man will dream of writing either a "Polyolbion," or a "Purple Island." Hither is to be referred the resemblance, often remarked, between the real poetry of our own day, and the tempestuous lift and versi-coloured emotion of the living drama. Poetry, when properly understood, has ever the same nature. It is an appeal to the common consciousness of man. It has to do with the vague and subtle feelings of the human breast. Its temperament is the clear chastity of past emotion. It is a common remark, that the poet expresses what others can only feel; he is that man, whose conceptions are most conscious. And in this lies the great benefit of poetry to the world. Although subjective, it can never descend to represent the mere notions or prejudices of one single mind. No phase or shade of emotion can be portrayed by it, which is not sanctioned by the mental experience of mankind. Plato himself, notwithstanding his proverbial contempt for poets, might have recognised here his own dialectician.

The two men to whom, in our opinion, the poetry of the last twenty years stands indebted for its proximate type, were of very opposed character. They are Wordsworth and Keats. The former said, nobly, that "of genius in the fine arts the only infallible sign is the widening the sphere of human sensibility, for the delight, honour, and benefit of human nature." This truth, uttered as a "consolation of philosophy," during the prevalence of garish popularists, did not find its complete fulfilment

in its enunciator. The unbending spirit of Wordsworth, which enabled him to endure with calmness the depreciation of his contemporaries, reposing himself on his own exalted ideal of a writer and a reader, refused to condescend at all to popular taste. His philosophic frigidity, the unnatural classification of many of his poems, and the prolixity of his great one, render him a sealed book to the majority even of *readers*. Consequently, with world-wide views and sympathies, his name is the text-word of a sect. Keats is equally ill-adapted for general popularity, but from opposite causes. His distinguishing trait is fancy,—fancy, rich, luxurious, and tender as moonlight. He plays like a child around the awful shrine of poesy, and, like a child, gets further in than most. Instead of the terse and severe eloquence of Wordsworth, he has carved out for himself a diction unequalled for gorgeousness and amplitude. This quality of fancy is the only one to which the brief career of the boy-poet allowed full development. In his latest fragment, the "*Hyperion*," he evidenced a might of imagination, which has left his name second to very few on our literary annals. Wordsworth was a poet from principle, Keats from instinct. From the confluence of these two streams, springs the latest development of poetry. It combines the philosophic depth of the one, and the fancy of the other, with the attractions of compactness and condensation; and the result has been the production of writing, among the most perfect that the world has seen. Indeed, the fallacy, that, in order to be a great poet, it is necessary to write a long poem, seems to be virtually abandoned. Few poems are now written that cannot be read at a sitting: and those that are otherwise,—such as the poems of the "*Festus*" and "*Life Drama*" school,—are evidently to be read piece-meal, have no completeness as a whole, depend for their effect on detached passages, and are even full of separate lyrical pieces. A long poem, as has been truly remarked by one who understood æsthetics better than any one else, is, in reality, nothing more than a succession of short ones, disconnected by intervals of prose; for the reason, that no mind can long sustain the extreme tension of poetical excitement, any more than a long chain of mountains can be of equal height throughout its extent. It is in the close-packed thought, the diamond hardness and polish, the unmixed purpose, of the "*fragments*" of Tennyson and others,—true and aphoristic as philosophy,—that we are to expect the high and real delighting of the world by poetry.

American poetry must be sought from the last few years. Here, as in other respects, she is the heiress of England. She has received poetry in a certain state of development, and it is her part to advance it; but several circumstances have prevented her from entering so fully on this part of her inheritance as on

others. Many of our readers will recollect the periodical castigations which, some time ago, it was the wont of the Tory journals to administer to the "institutions" and literature of the "model republic." Political animosity and authorial jealousy, aggravated by the unsettled state of the question of international copyright, insured for every thing American a reception, on this side the water, as unfavourable as lay within the resources of a criticism the keenest and most unsparing. A reviewer or magazinist, who might be desirous of imparting a relish to his forthcoming Number, could do nothing better than give some poor young New-Englander a toss. Here, as elsewhere, poetry offered the fairest mark; and most truly did the first of the occidental bards pass through the ordeal by fire. Want of originality, of vigour, of purpose, were the charges iterated against them by critics whose taste had been daintified during the mighty revel of genius which transfigured Europe throughout the past generation. A degree of schoolboy correctness of imitation was the utmost merit usually conceded. Passages, in this respect, unexceptionable, were half quoted, and abandoned with an *ennuyé* &c. Let the Americans, it was said, relinquish the common walks of poetry. We already possess descriptions of nature in her more usual moods, and of the soul in its more acknowledged phases. Let us not be bored with mere tame reprints of English poetry. To recruit the exhausted imagery and decayed fancy of the old world, by an infusion of novel forms of beauty from their own land, should be the object of the Americans, if they are to effect any thing at all; in a word, let them aim at some nationality in their effusions. This rebuke, albeit administered in wrath, and in bitterness received, was, in some measure, just; and the advice, though founded on false premises, good. Thirty years ago, America did not possess a national poetry,—a poetry whose patriotism is universally philanthropic. The genius of the people had been turned upon the nearer necessities of life; and, while the literature of reason was not without cultivation, that of taste remained comparatively uncultivated. "Our business," says a distinguished American writer, "has been to hew down the forest, to make paths and sawmills, railroads and steamboats; to lay the foundation of a great people; to provide for the emergencies of the day. As yet, there is no American literature which corresponds to the first principles of our institutions, as the English and French literatures correspond to theirs." The system of education, moreover, adopted in America, is better calculated for the wide diffusion of knowledge, than for the formation of a class of *litterati*; it produces vast numbers of sciolist citizens, but not an aristocracy of learning. But our periodical censors did not reflect that, in a country so peculiarly situated, a certain degree of imitation was at first inevitable; nay, was the earnest of future excellence. America did nationally what has been often

done individually; she began with imitation, in order to reach originality, consenting to receive the principles of art from its most practised cultivators, in order to re-produce them wedded to a living spirit. The process was natural and hopeful. In her the world had no need of a fresh exemplification of the progress of poetry, from the early lyric and epic upwards, any more than of a gradual national advance from a state of original savagery. The poetry of America, sudden as her civilization, was to be an off-shoot from the latest poetry of England. We purpose to show that this is the case; that the cutting from "the great vine of fable," which has been planted in Transatlantic soil, is already putting forth a separate, though kindred, vitality; and, in so doing, we hope to illustrate the workings, as well in perfection, as in excess and defect, of the great poetical principle which we have indicated. For this purpose, we have chosen three representatives,—Lowell, Longfellow, and Poe.

The name of RUSSELL LOWELL might have been replaced by several others, about equally known on this side of the Atlantic. He is selected as a good representative both of the excellencies and the defects which characterize a poetry trained in the rough school of utilitarianism. The errors of the age arise rather from a distorted perception, than from absolute ignorance of æsthetic truth. At present there seems great danger, in the home-bred American bards,—those who have never *seen* Europe,—of acting on a very partial apprehension of the true nature of poetry. They endeavour too openly to utilize her, forgetting that exalted beauty which is at once her essence and her highest object. From analyzing the soul, they make their art the index of society. Thus the modern science of sociology becomes a great part of their province. They set forth the laws of human intercourse and relation, those actions and reactions, in which cause becomes effect, and effect relapses into cause, with an unceasing advance towards that mighty destiny which looms nearer and more near; just as, at flow of tide, each broken column of wave, in its very subsidence, adds to the volume of its loftier and stronger successor. Such themes are very enticing: in the hands of those who know how to wield them, they have inspired some of the noblest lyrics of modern times; but, especially in an artistic point of view, and in America, they are liable to some very serious drawbacks. They make poetry reflect too much the notions and topics of the day, to the neglect of its own proper graces. They often lead into a wild extravagance, both of thought and expression, which has not failed to shock and alarm that numerous class of well-meaning persons, who, unable to separate the use of a thing from its abuse, deny the former *in toto*; and they thus retard the present working of many great and glorious truths. And they

introduce an indiscriminate use of that stereotyped phraseology, which marks a poetic era, no less surely than a peculiar terminology marks a philosophical sect; thus cramping the efforts of genius, and giving rise to a great deal of spurious imitation. Nothing is more remarkable in the aspect of literature, than the prodigious number of middling versicles, which, both here and in America, continually issue from the press. Our un-original poets—to use a paradoxical expression—have been unable to avoid a hackneyed mannerism, in consequence of their very appreciation of true poetry. Getting hold of some phrase, appropriate and happy enough, when used by the right owner and in its right collocation,—which they can perceive, but not apply,—they seek to work out an effect by a perversion, and fondly imagine, that, by linking their own immitigable crudities to the recognised diction, they have succeeded in producing the indefinable impression of the poet. Their bungling attempts at liberality and philosophy of sentiment remind us of the violent innocence and spontaneity of the Sylvias and Rosalinds of the comedy of last century; who came upon the stage with a skipping-rope, and drawled out artlessness in a sub-rustic vernacular. This class of writers chiefly haunts the “poetical department” of journalism; a cursory glance may detect them by the presence of such “*voces decomplexæ*” as may be formed by the most unlimited application of the doctrine of *hyphen*. They are usually perfect masters of the whole language of indefiniteness, by which means it is possible to give to the poorest and tritest observation an appearance of very great profundity indeed. How much of modern sentiment depends upon the skilful employment of plural for singular, and *vice-versâ*; upon the omission or insertion of an article, definite or indefinite!

Much of this is attributable to the advanced state of literature. Language, we are told, becomes more subtle and analytic as refinement advances. “With increasing cultivation finer distinctions are seen between the relations of objects, and corresponding expressions sought for to denote them.” Language, indeed, is become almost identical with thought; words, in poetry especially, are less symbols than ideas. At an earlier period in our history, before the various dialects introduced into the island were fully blended, the case was different. Thought was then, in a manner, independent of expression, and moved in it with a degree of stiffness and difficulty. The ponderous sentences of our ancestors anterior to Elizabeth, wending their way through a maze of curiously involved parentheses, and groaning beneath the weight of a sense they were scarcely able to manage, bear about the same resemblance to the piquancies wherewith the dainty modern reader is regaled, that the ribbed folio of a thousand pages bears to the trim octavo. There is in scarcely any of them an idiosyncrasy of style. Whole passages of Cranmer, for



example, might be re-modelled without hazard of impairing any well-nigh impalpable grace, any delicate shade of meaning. But alter or displace a sentence in Macaulay or Hallam, and the charm is gone; you have marred utterly the perspicacious *naïveté* of the one, the poised *hauteur* of the other. Hence it is, that authors of an earlier date in a literature bear translation so much better than later ones. How difficult, then, must it be, so to adapt the mechanism of language as to prevent a legitimate stage-effect from degenerating into a mere clap-trap; and, amid complexities of meaning so multitudinous and infinitely subtle, to avoid the appearance of affectation, and secure a real living style! Here is the test which distinguishes the genuine poet from the imitator.

But the same reason that renders this the true test, renders it also exceedingly difficult of application. It requires a poetical education to understand Tennyson. We never met with a taste which could at once enter into the beauty of that style which owns no law but truthfulness. So certain it is that man looks through an inverted telescope, that "those things which are first to nature are not first to man." The unfettered boldness, which delights the trained critic, perplexes and confounds the unreflective timidity which has been accustomed to gauge every thing by previous rules. A judgment of this sort would hardly be able to discern between poet and imitator; and, as is usually the case, would shrink from, and reject, both alike. These things, however, are only accidents: it need be no cause for wonder, that so mighty a whirlwind as poetry should catch up some rubbish in its career.

The above-mentioned blemishes have been shared by some of acknowledged genius: there is another equally important, which is not unfrequently a consequence of them,—we mean negligence and roughness of versification. A remark on this is particularly applicable here. We would strongly counsel the Americans to avoid roughness. At this date there can be no such thing as rude vigour. Much may be forgiven to youth and inexperience, as well national as individual; but the Americans have received a language ready-formed to their hands, and more capable than any other of delicate and harmonious treatment; and they must learn to manage it skilfully, before they can hope for much favour from the public of this country. We are aware that, both in England and America, there exists a class of writers amongst whom the notion prevails, that force and power of expression are to be cultivated at the expense of versification; who imagine that, to be Titanic, it is necessary to be clumsy;—an idea of composition which the curious may see carried *ad absurdum* in the poetical replies of the spirit-rapping manifestations. In poetry, all appearance of strength arising from ruggedness must be fallacious. If versification be a necessary part

of the expression of poetic thought, then, to fail in this is to confess inability to adapt thought to adequate expression. We can assure the class of writers referred to, unhappily already too numerous, that their invention is by no means new. "To wear a rough garment to deceive," was old in the days of Zechariah.

We have been led into these remarks without any direct reference to Mr. Lowell; although he is not free from an imitative mannerism and quaintness, although he does not always submit vigour of conception and moral purpose to the standard of that which is pleasing, and although most of his pieces are disfigured by a rough and inharmonious versification. But, for much the same reason that Aristotle speaks of injustice and vice, when desirous of conveying an idea of justice and virtue,—because it is easiest to treat of some things through their opposites,—we have attempted, by describing a false *meteorosophism*, to indicate still further our conception of the true nature of poetry. Mr. Lowell is, notwithstanding these faults, a fine specimen of the American man and poet. There is about him an uncommon buoyancy and freshness, and a salience of thought and language, which could only spring from a soul intensely earnest and alive to all that concerns humanity. He is fully imbued with the enthusiasm of the age, a respecter of his vocation, and a firm believer in the mighty destiny of mankind and of poetry. His lays are a foreshadow of the "good time coming;" they are hopeful as a voice from Pisgah. Even as an artist of his own school, his merits are great. There is nothing uncertain in his touch; his thoughts are often singularly bold and striking; he has an intimate acquaintance with nature, and a fearless appreciation of her minutest sights and sounds.

The longest of the poems, and that which most strongly displays the peculiar genius of the author, is the "Fable for the Critics." This is a remarkably clever satire, full of keen criticism, and showing a very extensive and appreciative knowledge of men and manners. It possesses considerable wit as well as comic force, but is chiefly marked by humour. This, the result only of a most kindly nature and unflagging vigour, embraces, in an atmosphere of homogeneousness, all other qualities. Its command of phrase and rhyme is absolutely unlimited. In these respects it is as wonderful as *Hudibras*.

As a sample of the exuberant fancy and vivid word-painting of Mr. Lowell, we cite the following description, taken from the "Vision of Sir Launfal," of the approach of winter, and the triumph of "King Frost:"—

"Down swept the chill wind from the mountain peak,  
From the snow five thousand summers old;  
On open wold and hill-top bleak  
It had gathered all the cold,

And whirl'd it like sleet on the wanderer's cheek ;  
 It carried a shiver every where,  
 From the unleaved boughs and the pastures bare.  
 The little brook heard it, and built a roof,  
 'Neath which he could house him, winter-proof ;  
 All night by the white stars' frosty gleams  
 He groin'd his arches and match'd his beams ;  
 Slender and clear were his crystal spars,  
 As the lashes of light that trim the stars ;  
 He sculptured every summer delight  
 In his halls and chambers out of sight ;  
 Sometimes his tinkling waters slipt  
 Down through a frost-leaved forest crypt ;  
 Long sparkling aisles of steel-stemm'd trees,  
 Bending to counterfeit a breeze ;  
 Sometimes the roof no fretwork knew,  
 But silvery masses that downward grew ;  
 Sometimes it was carved in sharp relief,  
 With quaint arabesques of ice fern-leaf ;  
 Sometimes it was simply smooth and clear,  
 For the gladness of heaven to shine through, and here  
 He had caught the nodding bulrush-tops,  
 And hung them thickly with diamond drops,  
 Which crystall'd the beams of moon and sun,  
 And made a star of every one.  
 No mortal builder's most rare device  
 Could match this winter-palace of ice ;  
 'T was as if every image that mirror'd lay  
 In his depths serene through the summer day,  
 Each fitting shadow of earth and sky,  
 Lest the happy model should be lost,  
 Had been mimick'd in fairy masonry,  
 By the elfin builders of the frost."

It is now about three years since the "Golden Legend," the latest production of PROFESSOR LONGFELLOW, was first submitted to British readers ; and it may seem strange that the work of one, who is among the closest bonds of union between the literature of this country and that of his own, should have hitherto excited, comparatively, but a small share of attention. The general opinion seems to be, that Longfellow has added little to his poetic renown by its publication. Nevertheless, it is instinct with the same exquisite sympathies, the same placid thinking melancholy, that dictated "Hyperion," that true "life-drama" of a soul made up of the fineness of the passions, whose very strength is its weakness, tremulous through excess of emotive power. It is another tale, by the bard of "Evangeline," of the "strength of woman's devotion," of that passive heroism—

" Whose very gentleness and weakness  
 Are like the yielding but irresistible air."

Its scene is in the heart of old Germany,—the land of Richter, the land of the poet's education,—whence he has imbibed the true spirit of the philosophical romance. To read it gives one a vision of dim, niched, grotesquely furnished rooms, groined roofs, and pointed windows; of portly Barons, stout Burghers, travelling Students, and visionary Monks. Like "Hyperion," it is the history of a noble soul, capable of the mightiest energies, yet possessed by a spirit of inglorious melancholy, and falling "from swoon to swoon" of sick and inert brooding, but which is led, through weakness and anguish, to freedom, to duty, and to God. We are reminded by this simple and affecting *dénouement*,—the recovery of such a spirit from the enthrallments of selfishness after many an effort and false remedy,—of some vast cathedral in that same German land, when the summer day-break is pouring through its windows, and flooding with rich light the solemn haunts consecrated to God and man, which but now were the abode of spectral darkness, or flashed only with the mimic torch. How is it, then, that such a production should have met with but partial success? The fact is, that it is both false in its professedly dramatic form, and is by no means a perfect specimen even of a modern *amateur* drama. We scarcely need observe that the drama, that bright foam-wreath cast up by the encountering waters of civilization and barbarism, is, as a vital organ of the spirit of poetry, irrecoverably extinct; and the themes with which Longfellow deals,—the vaguer and more indefinable emotions,—are not well adapted for it. They require the more deliberate and accurate analysis of the modern substitute for the drama,—the philosophizing novel,—in which form of writing the Professor has been most successful. Accordingly, in this view, the "Golden Legend" is a failure. "Elsie," as a heroine, lacks interest; her devotion arises from pietistic instinct, not from passion; she appears too slight to experience or excite much emotion. The supernatural machinery, too, is rather childishly managed; perhaps in imitation of the monkish "Miracle Play," which is actually introduced; at all events, "Lucifer" is little better than the devil of a piece of Popish mummery. This, though it may tend to give an antiquarian reality to the poem, is a desertion of the true poetic stand-point,—that stand-point, whence nothing seems incongruous that can aid an effect, whence the universe is seen as a unit undivided by time and space, and which has given us Shakspeare's anachronisms and Spenser's physically impossible grove, wherein appeared—

"The sailing pine, the cedar proud and tall,  
The vine-propt elm, the poplar never dry,  
The builder oak, sole king of forests all,  
The aspen good for staves, the cypress funeral."

with the "thirteen more in the next stanza," when, as Mr. Hallam complains, "every one knows that a natural forest never

contains such a variety of species." Not only was Spenser on enchanted ground, but so is every poet.

Such seems to be the defect of a poem, of which the beauty and delicacy of sentiment are the Professor's own, which threads with a light and gentle step the maze of youthful agonies, at that time when "the soul is in a ferment, the character undecided, the way of life uncertain, the ambition thick-sighted." This is the peculiar, the pious aim of Longfellow's writings: he stands as interpreter between genius and itself; he is at home with the quietest, and therefore the strongest and most intimate, feelings of the breast,—those feelings which underlie the whole nature, prompters to its more active parts, but which it belongs to the temperament of genius, in its ceaseless self-inspection, to stir into consciousness, and which, so stirred, occasion endless disquietude and misery, like the beating of the heart or the action of the nerves, which, habitually unfelt, are the source of health and life; but, when they occupy the attention, of intolerable uneasiness and agony. In this sense it is true, that the man of genius "learns by suffering;" he enters upon an education which requires the neglect of some parts of his nature, and the unhealthy development of others; he must be regarded as having sacrificed to the benefit of mankind that due balance and harmony of the faculties, which is essential to happiness. Hence proceed misanthropy, sickly sensibility, complaining weakness, and "all the thousand bitters" which too often disfigure poetry,—that of the young especially. Professor Longfellow's poetic ideal is not a spirit of peevish and querulous contradiction to the divine order of things,—a spirit which "tears at all the creeds," and which, in reality, notwithstanding its defiant attitude and indignant eloquence, is the quintessence of weakness and selfishness. That mood he, indeed, depicts, as a process in the formation of the perfect poetic character;—as, who that thinks at all has not at some time held struggle with the hydra-crest of atheism in his own soul?—but he has searched his heart for something better than gall and wormwood: he does not live merely to pour into the world's ear the broken wailing music of complaint; his poet is not one who is yet struggling with deep waters, but one who has already gained firm footing, and who labours sympathizingly and cheerfully to impart to his fellow-men the joy and courage which he has gained from his own experience. It is in administering such consolation, and inspiring such hope, that the real use of poetry lies; and herein she vindicates her divine origin as descended from the same skies with religion, whose offices she is thus ennobled in sharing; and, whilst providing for these yearnings of the moral nature, she becomes a part of the true *γνώθι σεαυτὸν* philosophy, supplying many of the neglects of philosophy, properly so called.



Hitherto we have seen what may be called the conscious subjectivity of poetry carried to an extreme, becoming a mere reflex of the spirit of the age, and of the aspirations of enthusiasm, and hereby made to affect "a saucy roughness," strikingly at variance with the pleasure which it belongs to poetry to excite in the soul; and we have also beheld it embodying such an amount of human feeling as is consistent with poetic beauty and perfection. We are now to regard it in another extreme, not as swerving from the eternal principles of beauty through too great sympathy with the agitations of humanity, but as deprived of a legitimate interest, as losing a healthy and human tone, through want of this sympathy.

It may seem strange that utilitarian America should have been the birth-land of one who, perhaps of all poets, exhibits the most exquisite rhythmic treatment, and whose verse borrows least from without, is least dependent upon external aids and associations. Such, nevertheless, is the case: the man was EDGAR POE. This name is already known to many in this country; but it is rather regarded as the prefix to a life of moral turpitude and a premature death, than as the emblem of the rarest genius. Few there are who appreciate Poe; and, of them, some endeavour to separate the writer from the man; whilst others, unwilling to believe evil of one to whom they are compelled to do reverence, seek to palliate his conduct, believe accounts to be exaggerated, and that Poe was no worse than his neighbours, but that the brightness of his genius made any moral *peccadillo* he might commit more conspicuous. From each of these courses we are compelled to dissent. That brief and frightful history is far too well authenticated, and, we must add, in one of the peculiar temperament of Poe, far too *likely*, to be explained away or denied. And to separate from the productions of a writer that knowledge of his character which is to be gained from his career, is to abandon the key to the right understanding of the former. Poe belonged to a class. There are a few, appearing now and then upon the earth, whose life is one habitual tension of soul, a ceaseless watch maintained by the spirit over the perceptive nature, a self-concentration and collectedness, which draws and moulds into itself every thing around. These are the true "heritors of unfulfilled renown,"—the men who never sleep, who become the slaves of morbid habits, who die young. Possessed of splendid temper, often of extraordinary *physique*, in mental sensibility and energy the most perfect of the race, endowed, as if by instinct, with universal knowledge, they yet do little, are only passively affected by the movements of society, and seem to pass through life as through a vivid dream. It is seldom that circumstances induce them to clothe their own fine and infinitely subtle intuitions in the grosser garb of language. Then they let fall a few words as

a memory, which, like the dreamy mutterings of sleep, serve to show the whereabouts of the thoughts,—are half a concealment, half a revelation, of the mysteries of the inner spirit. Neither in their errors, nor in their perfections, are such men to be judged by any ordinary standard. Whatever they write, is a psychological memoir of themselves: they are absolutely the prey of their own minds; they never escape themselves; all their thoughts are interior sensations. And the very perfection of their faculties, the taste which lies at the centre of their being, insures that these sensations shall be purely æsthetic. A certain amount of moral insensibility, an isolation from the movements of the world, are the inevitable results of a mind so entirely æsthetic. "Would," we involuntarily exclaim, "that this nature could be imbued with a feeling of philanthropy, that this mind were gifted with an active moral sense, that these fiery passions could be fashioned into use!" It has not been so yet; and that man, in his most perfect form, has not yet fully spoken to man, is a reflection full of hope to the world. Of this order was Poe a type. His ardent passions seem to have existed for nothing else than to be subjects for the experimenting of his intellect; and this has invested their wildest freaks with an indescribable *finesse* and grace. His career is a terrible instance of what one may become whose course is guided by such a principle as this. More reckless expenditure of energy, more utter disregard of the claims of others, of the world, it is impossible to imagine. Into the details of that life we need not enter: they have already often enough pointed the moral of critic and biographer. We have only to do with them so far as regards an estimate of the writings of Poe.

America had little share in the formation of his character. His education was European. When very young, he travelled all over England, and remained for five years at school near London. Thence returning home, he entered the University at Charlottesville, where, says his biographer, "the remarkable ease with which he mastered the most difficult studies kept him in the first rank for scholarship; and he would have graduated with the highest honours, had not his gambling, intemperance, and other vices induced his expulsion from the University." This, and subsequent misconduct, occasioned a rupture with his friends, and he again repaired to Europe "on a Quixotic expedition to join the insurgent Greeks." His Grecizing enthusiasm probably evaporated with the voyage; at all events, he never reached his destination. But at this time he traversed nearly the whole of Europe, visiting Russia, France, and Italy. Of such an education his genius was the counterpart: it was European; it was Italian. He belonged in spirit to that land in which nature—the art of God—is so blended with human works and associations, as to become almost the art of man,—a symbol of human

faculties, and no longer an appeal to human consciousness. So, the great characteristic of Poe's poetry is—we will not say, science, but—conscious art. Had he not been a poet, he would have been the most consummate critic that ever lived. Every piece that he ever wrote, with all its seeming spontaneity and living grace, is yet the product of the most inexorable taste, of the theoretic principles of poetry existing in his own mind; and every part, when examined, will assume an air of rigid and inviolable connexion. There is no ebullience in him; nothing foreign to his purpose occurs; a digression, however beautiful, he would have considered a blemish. Each of his little poems is a study, designed to illustrate some æsthetic principles upon which the ever-musing spirit was at the time engaged. "The Raven," his most known poem, the only one which he laboured to render universally appreciable, with all its mastery of passion, its weird and unearthly effect, is no more than this. In the paper entitled "The Philosophy of Composition," he has left us a minute account of the process of its formation,—consequently, a portraiture of himself. He gives a quiet, admirably perspicuous detail of each succeeding step: how he resolved to write a poem which should embody a certain effect, produce a certain impression; how he deliberately analyzed the various modes which might be employed for this purpose, selecting the best; how from these *data* he excogitated all the paraphernalia of his poem, and, with his thinking finished, his plan elaborated to the *dénouement*, first set pen to paper in the composition of the last stanza but two. There is one short sentence which reveals the whole man. After mentioning that he began with the stanza,—

"'Prophet,' said I, 'thing of evil, prophet still, if bird or devil,  
By the heavens that bend above us, by the God we both adore,  
Tell this soul with sorrow laden, if within the distant Aidenn,  
It shall clasp a sainted maiden, whom the angels name Lenore,  
Clasp a rare and radiant maiden, whom the angels name Lenore?'  
Quoth the Raven, 'Nevermore.'"

He adds, "Had I been able, in the subsequent composition, to construct more vigorous stanzas, I should have purposely enfeebled them, so as not to interfere with the climacteric effect." Could any one else have said that?

It is scarcely possible to over-estimate the artistic merits of Poe. Not only were such faculties as he had, possessed in an eminent degree,—but he possessed *all* the faculties of the artist. His numbers, moving to a purpose under the guidance of an unflinching taste, resemble the trained battalions of an Alva or a Cromwell; which, we are told, "marched to victory with the rigid precision of machines, whilst burning with the wildest enthusiasm of Crusaders." There is in them no stiffness, no appearance of elaboration; free scope is given to an invention, that is, an imagination, in the highest sense of the word, "*creative*;"

and this is ever accompanied by a power of analysis the subtlest and most minute, by which every thing is reduced to congruity : no room is left for the improbable ; and we are enwrapped in a true dream-atmosphere, where, dream-like, nothing jars, every faculty is excited and gratified ; and the result is a delightful, unresisting abandonment of the whole soul to the guidance of the poet, whose amazing skill we only pause to examine at the end, when striving to ascertain what it is that has so spelled us. The joint operation of these two qualities has made Poe the most original of modern poets. He struck out for himself a path far divergent, and it has never since been followed. He has not even an imitator. His "Raven" is the completest example of conscious art that has ever been exhibited. We have already seen how every thing in it is toned down to suit a proposed climacteric effect ; and we must further refer those who wish to understand the genius of the author, to his own astonishing account of its elaboration. Another wonderful little poem is that entitled, "For Annie." This is a flight of thinking almost superhuman, yet how lightly and easily sustained ! A still life, haunting the body after "the fever called living" is past,—the apparently inanimate clay, yet instinct with a passive consciousness, like the awakening from a trance, and visited by slight things, half memories, half new and pleasant fancies, which never surprise : could such a conception have entered any other brain ? Who can read these exquisitely *naïve* lines, remembering that they are supposed as written by a dead man, without a start ?—

"And I lie so composedly  
Now in my bed,  
That any beholder  
Might fancy me dead ;  
Might start at beholding me,  
Thinking me dead."

There are other pieces, such as "Dreamland," "The Haunted Palace," "The Sleeper," "Ulalume," which we should be disposed to dwell on, but can only name. These have afforded us infinite amazement at the inspired art of the poet, mingled with a regret and melancholy, springing from their very tone, and which have centred naturally upon his untimely fate.

A perception so refined of the essentials of art led Poe to pay particular attention to the graces both of rhythm and metre. In these respects he is unrivalled. It is no exaggeration to say, that the finest ear ever formed for rhythm was possessed by him. The full harmonious flowing, the light and exquisite poise, of his verses, are unequalled in the language. His very roughnesses have meaning ; they give relief, they delight, like the daring dissonances of a skilled musician. We may instance, in particular, "Annabel Lee," a lovely little lyric, which goes dancing

along, like a light boat on a summer sea. He is singular, again, for his mastery over metres. Every metre which he uses is modified by his peculiar touch, assumes an original appearance, and is enwoven with the very nature of his theme. In this last particular, we know of no modern poet to compare with him, except Tennyson. How admirably managed are the changes, the slightly varied repetitions *da capo*, by which this effect of originality is wrought! But some of the metres in which he writes are actually original; that of the "Raven," for instance, is an elaborate piece of invention. It is this, more than any thing else, that stamps Poe as a great poet. How little is ever done in the way of stanzical combination! what an event is a new metre! Poe himself seems to have been astonished at it. In the paper from which we have already quoted, he roundly affirms, that "no man for centuries has ever done, or seemed to dream of doing, an original thing in verse." We think there is no great cause of astonishment. It is not once in centuries that an entirely new phase of human consciousness is brought to light, and requires a sheerly novel form of expression. The majority even of those who are accounted great original poets, traverse again and again the same field, make their discoveries in an old region. However they may twist the kaleidoscope, they use the same colours still. Hence, they confine themselves to metres, already sanctioned by association to their own subjects. These they vary and modify to an accordance with their own state of feeling, just as they view the same sphere of thought from different points; but it is the exhibition of a totally new metre which alone signifies a caste of mind hitherto unexpressed.

The same dispassionate passionateness, the same ceaseless watch maintained by the subtle intellect over the sentient nature, the same marvellous power of analysis, cold, bright, cruel, as the Greek painter, who, in order to gain a grander ideal of agony for his Prometheus, tortured his prisoner to death,—pervade the "Tales." Poe's writings are like his life,—they are the result of a series of experiments upon his own nature. A continual self-production runs through them: he is a very Byron in this. Himself may be recognised in the Legrand and Dupin of his first series of tales. The singular faculty of solution possessed by them,—a faculty apparently intuitive, yet really "the very soul and essence of method,"—is a description of one of the main attributes of the author's own mind. He lets us still further into the mystery of that self-absorption, which was at once the bane and the perfection of his character, in his tale of "The Assignment." The hero of this tale,—that "ill-fated and mysterious man," who, "squandering away a life of magnificent meditation in that city of dim visions," Venice, lived apart in a "habit of intense and continual thought, pervading even his most trivial actions, intruding upon his moments of dalliance,



and interweaving itself with his very flashes of merriment, like adders which writhe from out the eyes of the grinning masks around the temple of Persepolis;" who enveloped himself in a boudoir of more than regal magnificence, the embodiment of his own fancy, where, in defiance of timid decorum, "the chastity of Ionia was offended by antediluvian devices, and the sphynxes of Egypt outstretched upon carpets of gold," where the senses were steeped in the tremblings of an unseen music, and the mingled perfumes of "strange convolute censers;" whose acquirements embraced the sum of human knowledge, but who took a singular pleasure in concealing them; *who to an English birth added an Italian life*; finally, who, his spirit "writhing in fire," departed so abruptly to the "land of real dreams,"—he, we say, is no other than the poet himself. Again: perchance, at a later, darker period, is Poe personified in the pitiable hypochondriac, "Usher:" certainly that air, rather than song, "The Haunted Palace," is the very strain of morbid consciousness. There is a strong significance in the invariable form of these narratives: they are related by a second person,—a type of that psychal duality to which we have already often alluded as the characteristic of Poe's temperament. The whole tone and manner of the tales give evidence of an unhealthily stimulated mind. We stand appalled at the preternatural acumen which could construct such an astounding succession and complication of incident, and draw a magnetic circle of such enthrallment. It is as though a madman should lay before us in logical outline the whole grotesquerie of delirium. In that peculiarly modern species of literature,—the literature of the horrible, which seems to be the offspring of the human craving after preternatural excitement, driven from the belief in ghouls and goblins, and discovering that the true horrors of man are in himself,—Poe stands almost alone. No one is more at home in the glooms and shadows of the inner world; no one is more skilful in the dissection of human agony, the sensations of nerve-haunted disease, the moods in which the mind is conquered by the fancies it has conjured up. There is in him, to use his own words, "a species of energetic concision," which unflinchingly traverses the whole range of the morbidly excited mind, from its most fairy phantasies to its most grewsome horrors.

This tendency, which renders his "Tales" the most perfect of their kind, exercises a fascinating, but deleterious, influence upon his poetry. It greatly narrows his sphere: to reverse a sentence of his editor, "his circle, though a magic, was a narrow, one." We have already remarked on the insensibility to human interests occasioned in Poe by an exclusively æsthetic bent. He fell into "that true hell of genius," where art is regarded not as a means, but as an end. His poetry derives nothing from the world of man, reflects in no degree the agitations

of society, is fraught with none of the enthusiastic philanthropy of the age, never even implies a moral; therefore it will never be popular. It is not meant for universal approbation; it is a sacrifice upon the altar of taste. Hence there is imparted to it a certain fantastic character, as to a musical performance confined to a few notes; and this sometimes betrays a touch of madness, a sort of mental *hysteria*. He has written madness,—deliberate, concinnate madness, but still madness; his guarded glance, ever retorted upon himself, is terrible, like the vivid, yet serpent, glance of the madman's eye. To read these poems is to be melancholy. They are the broken fragments of a being once of unmatched glory and beauty, the scant remains of, potentially, the greatest word-artist of modern times.

It is lamentable to think of the degraded and unhappy life of such a man; but it would be criminal to omit all references to its striking moral. The lesson so often repeated in literary history, but ignored, if not denied, in the present day, is here written as it were in blood and tears; to wit, the total insufficiency of art or mental culture, be they never so complete, to rescue man from the fatal proclivity of his nature. We commend to a certain class, "religious philosophers" of the day,—worshippers of genius and of science,—the study of Edgar Poe. From his life and writings they may gather some curious illustrations of "the intuitive religion of the heart."

- 
- ART. VI.—1. *The Church of Christ, in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry; with a particular Reference to the Controversy on the Subject between Romanists and Protestants.* By EDWARD ARTHUR LITTON, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Stockton Heath, Cheshire, &c. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1851.
2. *The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, in its Relation to Mankind and the Church.* By ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding. Fourth Edition. London: John Murray. 1852.
3. *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.* By ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding. Second Edition. London: John and Charles Mozley. 1853.
4. *The Sacramental and Priestly System examined; or, Structures on Archdeacon Wilberforce's Works on the Incarnation and Eucharist.* By CHARLES SMITH BIRD, M.A., F.L.S., Canon of Lincoln, &c. London: Seeleys. 1854.
5. *The Principles of Church Government, and their Application to Wesleyan Methodism. With Appendices.* By GEORGE STEWARD. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1853.

6. *The Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church: viewed in their Scriptural and Theological Aspects; and in relation to Principles professed by the Wesleyan Methodists.* By THE REV. ALFRED BARRETT. London: John Mason. 1854.

By those who have written on the subject of the constitution of the Church of Christ, it has been generally deemed to be necessary, or convenient, first, to define the various senses in which the term "*Church*" is used in Scripture; secondly, to fix the sense, or senses, in which it so exists, as that the attributes of a *constitution* and *polity* may be properly attached to it; and, lastly, to determine the principles and model on which that constitution and polity ought to be established.

With reference to such definitions, it is almost universally agreed that, in its highest and primary scriptural import, the term "*Church*" is used to denote that one mystical body of which Christ is the sole Head, and in the unity of which all saints, whether in heaven, or on earth, or elsewhere, are necessarily included as constituent parts of the great whole. It is also agreed, except on the part of the Romanists, that so much of this body as is upon earth is, to the outward sense, utterly *invisible*. But at this point the agreement terminates, or, to speak more correctly, the differences of opinion have a wider divergence. In the first place, there is considerable difference on the question, *who* they are that constitute the Church *not* upon earth,—but in heaven or elsewhere. The general persuasion is, that they are "*the saved*" from among *men*, of all ages and peoples, from the beginning to the end of the world. But Augustin—with what seems to us an officious intent to add somewhat to the glory which belongs to the Church from its eternal union with its glorious Head—brings in the *blessed angels*, as constituting from the beginning an integral portion of that Church. "We are," says he, "in conjunction with them, one city of God, to which it is said in one of the Psalms, 'Glorious things are spoken of thee, O thou city of God!' whereof part is in a state of pilgrimage (or away from home) amongst us, and part assists with them."\* And the "*city of God*" is, in his use of the term, synonymous with the "*Church*."† Nor can the statements so frequently occurring in his writings, to the same effect, be passed over as being simply specimens of the rhetorical extravagances, for which the very best of the "*Fathers*" are remarkable; because, in fact, the things asserted therein did not pass away with him, but still survive, as things to be received not merely on the ground of his assertion of them, but on the authority of "*infalli-*

\* "*Cum ipsa angelis unus una Civitas Dei, cui dicitur in Psalmo, 'Gloriosa dicta sunt de te, Civitas Dei;' cujus pars in nobis peregrinatur, pars in illis opitalatur.*"—*De Civitate Dei*, lib. x., cap. 7.

† *Ibid.*, lib. xviii., cap. 29; lib. xiii., cap. 16.

bility" itself. "The Church triumphant," says the Tridentine Catechism, "is that most noble, glorious, and happy assembly and multitude of the *blessed spirits*, and of those souls who have valiantly triumphed over this world, over the flesh, and over the most wicked devil; and, being free and safe from the troubles of this life, now enjoy eternal blessedness."\* And, in the *Theologia* of P. Dens,—the authority of which will not be scrupled, either at the University of Louvain, or the College of Maynooth,—it is stated, that "the Church triumphant comprehends all the blessed in heaven, as well *angels* as men." For reasons which will be obvious as we proceed, though not for the same reasons in both cases, it was not convenient to the purpose of either the framers of the Catechism, or the author of the Theology, to distinguish the Church universal, in its widest meaning, into the two particular branches of the *visible* and the *invisible*; or, under the former of these divisions, the authority of Dens would have required us to add, as one of the parts of the Church not on earth, and therefore invisible, the "assemblage of the souls detained in purgatory." The Catechism makes an attempt to evade the felt awkwardness of the case, by saying, that "the *principal* parts of the Church are *two*, of which one is called 'triumphant,' the other 'militant;'" and so stealthily leaves the "suffering Church" (named in the enumeration of Dens) in the silence in which, for consistency's sake, the doctrine itself, of a purgatory after death, ought to have been left a few pages before.†

We have spoken of the term "Church" as comprehending, in its highest and primary sense, all the saved from amongst men throughout all time, they constituting the members of that mystical body, of which Christ is the sole and everlasting Head; and part of that body being already in heaven, and the residue, which shall make it complete, being in the course of following after. It is, next, a subject of interesting and grave inquiry, whether that term is ever used in any lower sense, either by Christ himself, or by any one of his Apostles. That it is so used by Christ, in any instance, will hardly be pretended, even by the Romanists themselves; inasmuch as the Church, on *their*

\* "*La (Chiesa) trionfante è quella nobilissima, gloriosissima e felicissima schiera e moltitudine degli spiriti beati, e delle anime di quelle, che di questo mondo, della carne, e del iniquissimo demonio hanno trionfato, e dalle molestie di questa vita liberi e securi ora si godono l'eterna beatitudine.*"—Catechism, p. 83, or "Instructions *ad Parochos*, according to the Decree of the Council of Trent, first published by Command of the Supreme Pontiff, Pius V., and afterwards translated, by Order of the same, into the vulgar Tongue, and now printed by Order of our Lord Clement XIII., at Rome, in the Printing-Office of the Apostolical Chamber, 1761."

† "*Ecclesia (generatim sumpta) dividitur in tria membra, nimirum, in ecclesiam triumphantem, patientem et militantem. Ecclesia triumphans complectitur omnes in cælo beatos, tam angelos, quam homines; ecclesia patiens est cætus animarum in purgatorio detentarum; militans est cætus fidelium viatorum, seu in terrâ adhuc peregrinantium.*"—*Theologia Moralis et Dogmatica*, P. Dens, tom. ii., p. 113.

theory, includes none but those who are saved, or eventually will be so, either in this world or the next. Or, be that as it may, there are few that will deny that the Church of which our Saviour speaks as being that which he "will build," and against which "the gates of hell shall not prevail," consists only of those who are believers, in truth as well as in profession. And—to borrow the words of Mr. Litton—"we see no reason to believe that the Apostles, in calling a Church a 'community of saints or believers,' employed those expressions in any other than the highest sense."\* The first recorded instance of their use of the term, after the ascension of their Master, is in proof of their understanding and using it in the sense in which we have reason for assuming that he always used it. "The Lord added to the Church daily such as were saved," or,—as Mr. Litton and others may have leave to understand it,—“such as were in the course of being saved,” τοὺς σωζομένους. (Acts ii. 47.) And the inscriptions of their pastoral Epistles to the Churches are to persons of this class only:—

"To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called (to be) saints:"—  
 "Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called (to be) saints:"—  
 "Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia:"—  
 "Unto the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus:"—  
 "To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons:"—  
 "To the saints and faithful brethren which are at Colosse:"—  
 "To the Church of the Thessalonians, which is in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ:"—  
 "To the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ:"—  
 "To those who have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:"—  
 "To them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Christ Jesus, and called."

The only exceptions to this style of address are the inscriptions "to the Churches of Galatia," and "to the Twelve Tribes scattered abroad." With regard to the *first* of these exceptions, it is clear, partly from the peculiarity of the inscription itself, and still more from the tenor of the Epistle, that the Galatian Churches, though retaining the name, had forfeited the character, of Churches of God, and are therefore not addressed as such. They were "removed to another Gospel" than that of Christ and his Apostles, through the seduction of false teachers, who "had destroyed all that was vital in Christianity, and rejected all that was fundamental, and consequently overturned the Churches which the Apostles had planted."† In this respect,

\* "Church of Christ," p. 306.

† Rev. R. Watson's Works, vol. iii., p. 56.



the case of the Church at Corinth, though bad enough in its own way, was yet widely different from that of the Galatian Churches. The Corinthians had not left "the foundation" which the Apostle had laid, but were simply building, or were in danger of building, upon it, "wood, hay, and stubble," along with, or in the place of, "gold, silver, and precious stones;" whereas the Galatians, in the very fact of being "removed to another Gospel," which utterly "perverted the Gospel of Christ," were laying a new and false foundation. The former might "be saved so as by fire;" but to the latter, persisting in the new course they had adopted, or were proceeding to adopt, salvation was utterly impossible. Their error was fundamental, and destructive in its very nature. The Apostle even "stood in doubt of them," whether they had been really "called into the grace of Christ," and whether he had not bestowed upon them "labour in vain." "He did not call them 'saints,' because they had departed from the faith, in the fundamental article of justification."\*

The inscription of the Epistle of James, "To the Twelve Tribes which are scattered abroad," is rather an apparent, than a real, exception, as the expression may be fairly considered as referring "to the believing Jews, of whatever tribe, who were dispersed over the earth, to whom it is probable that James, still remaining at Jerusalem, sent this Epistle, by those who were used to meet at that city, from all nations, at the festivals."†

There thus appear to be two senses only in which the term "Church of God," or "Church of Christ," is used in Scripture. The first is that in which, being taken in its widest meaning, it denotes the *whole* mystical body of Christ in its perfect and glorified condition, or in its gradual progress to that consummation. The second is that in which, being understood in a more limited meaning, it denotes a plurality of persons, now or hereafter to be, on the earth, sustaining, or supposed to sustain, the character expressed, or of necessity implied, in the inscriptions of the pastoral Epistles, whether scattered abroad, or congregated in the form of separate societies: it being understood, however, first, that the persons so characterized are not presumed to be all thoroughly matured as members "of the family of God and of the household of faith," but to be "babes," or "little children," or "young men," or "fathers," according to their various grades of proficiency towards "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ;" and, secondly, that it is not the *Churches* which such societies constitute, but the *individuals* who compose the societies, that are (if they be in truth what they profess to be) the "members" of the mystical body of Christ. In other words, borrowed from Dr. John Owen,—

\* Rev. T. Scott's Commentary, Gal. i. 2.

† Beza, *in loc.*

"The things ascribed unto those who are to be esteemed the proper subject-matter of a visible Church, are such as, in the judgment of charity, entitle them to all the appellations of 'saints,' 'called,' 'sanctified,'—that is, visibly and by profession—which are given unto the members of all the Churches in the New Testament; and which must be answered in those who are admitted into that privilege, if we do not wholly neglect our only patterns. There is nothing more certain, in matter of fact, than that evangelical Churches, in their first constitution, were made up and did consist of such members as we have described, and no others. Nor is there one word in the whole Scripture, intimating any concession or permission of Christ, to receive into his Church those who are not so qualified. No man, as I suppose, is come unto that profligate sense of spiritual things, as to deny that the members of the Church ought to be *visibly holy*. For, if so, they may affirm, that all the promises and privileges granted to the Church do belong to them who visibly live and die in their sins; which is to overthrow the Gospel. And if they ought so to be, and were so at first, when they are not so, *openly and visibly*, there is a declension from the original constitution of Churches, and a sinful deviation in them from the law of Christ." \*

The use of the term "Church," in any lower senses than those above specified, is purely arbitrary, or, at the best, conventional; and is of authority only so far as the senses adopted approximate to those which are strictly scriptural. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

We are thus furnished with a rule on which we may rely, and from which no appeal can be admitted, for testing whatever definitions of a Church may be proposed for our acceptance. And neither ecclesiastical authorities, nor authorities of any other description, can bar our right to determine for ourselves, to what extent they approach, or recede from, the original and divinely-settled standard. Thus, also, the controversy between Protestants and Romanists, on this particular point, is pressed into small compass, and brought by an easy process, or rather by simple inspection and comparison, to a short and safe issue. We have only to notice the bare fact that the Romanists comprehend, in their definition of the "*visible Church*," a *visible Head*, of whom the Scriptures know nothing, a host of sinners of the vilest description, (and who, by the scriptural rule, are totally excluded, as being "the children of the devil," and the subjects of "the power of darkness,") and a motley crowd of *merely nominal* professors, (under the plausible but ambiguous designation of "the faithful,") whom the scriptural standard utterly condemns, as persons having "their portion with hypocrites and unbelievers;" and, on their own showing of the facts of the case, we are shut up to the conclusion, that their Church is *Catholic*

---

\* "True Nature of a Gospel Church," chap. i.

indeed, with a witness ; but that to call it "*Apostolical*," or to consider it as being a "Church of Christ" at all, is little better than a disgusting and impious burlesque upon the name.

In the application of the same easy and safe rule, there is as little difficulty in dealing with the definition or ideal of a Church, (as to the *persons* who compose it,) recently set forth by Archdeacon Wilberforce and others, as with that of the Romanists.

"The Church," says the Archdeacon, "is His (Christ's) body mystical. And by the mystical body of Christ is meant the whole family of those who, by the Holy Ghost, are united in Church ordinances to his *man's nature*. And our union with the manhood of Christ is brought about in our union with the Church. *It is not that one of these is the means or channel through which we approach the other*, but that, since the two processes are identical, it is impossible to divide them. For *that which joins men to Christ's mystical body, the Church, is their union with his man's nature*; and their means of union with his human nature is bestowed in his Church or body mystical. *The Sacraments, which are the means of binding us to the mystical body of Christ, derive their efficacy from the influence of his body.*"\*—*Incarnation*, p. 255.

The definition contained in this extract, to say nothing of the obvious contradiction and confusion existing between the sentences which we have given in "*italics*," is rendered ambiguous by the Archdeacon's using the term "*ordinances*" in the commencement of the paragraph, and the term "*sacraments*" at its close, in such a manner as to leave it doubtful whether the two terms are to be taken as being equipollent and convertible, or not; and so, by the way, furnishes an instance in proof that, in their theological teaching, even more than in their ecclesiastical architecture,

\* "Hence," says the Archdeacon, "the impossibility of answering a question which is sometimes asked, Whether men are joined to Christ by being joined to his Church, or joined to his Church by being joined to him? It would be a parallel question to ask, Whether we were sharers in Adam's nature because we were men, or men because we were sharers in Adam's nature? The two relations hang inseparably together." ("Incarnation."—*Ibid.*) So, undoubtedly, they do. But what then? The "question," in each of these two cases, may be thrown into the form of a *disjunctive* proposition, containing two members, or categorical propositions, of which, according to the law of propositions of that class, (where *sober reasoning* is intended,) only *one can be true*, and *the other must be false*. But, according to his teaching, as given above, the two members in each of the disjunctive propositions are *both true*. His putting, therefore, of the question, in each case, is purely nugatory and absurd; and the supposed "impossibility" of answering either of the questions amounts simply to this,—that no one can say *which* of the two categorical propositions, in either case, is *false*, because *both are true*.—With respect to the *second* of these questions, it is enough to say, that, by *logical inference*, we are sharers of Adam's nature *because* we are men; and, by *physical consequence*, we are men *because* we are sharers of Adam's nature. The *first* question is not, as the Archdeacon assumes, "parallel" to the second. In order to its being so, as well as for the farther purpose of its being consistent with his own teaching, that question should have been, "Whether men are joined to Christ *because* they are joined to the Church, or joined to the Church *because* they are joined to him?" And, thus made parallel, it would admit of an answer similar to that which has been given to the second question,—its first proposition being understood to declare a *logical*, and its second a *spiritual*, sequence; and the "impossibility," in both cases, "*tenues fugit, cœn fumus, in auras!*"

the School of which he must now be regarded as the type and representative, court the "*dim religious light*." To use the very apt language of Mr. Bird, "Cloudiness and mistiness pervade the Archdeacon's book; when we turn to it, we breathe heavily, and walk darkly." And, for the purpose of presenting the *whole* of his definition, it is necessary to bring out—we fear, at the expense of the reader's patience—other extracts, from another of his books:—

"The ordinance of Baptism," the Archdeacon says, (after an interval long enough to make his readers, and himself, too, forget what he had written more than a hundred pages before,) "wherein men are made members of the body of Christ, makes them partakers also of his life. Its purpose is, to establish a spiritual connexion between the soul and the humanity of the Second Adam, whereby we may be made members of his mystical body, and thus be engrafted into the Divine nature. But if we sin, as all men sin, after Baptism, this connexion is relaxed, if it is not broken. The effect of these (positive acts of transgression) is to break asunder"—just now, it might be simply to *relax*—"that connexion with Christ on which the life of the soul is dependent. And since these evils separate men from Christ, they put them out of a state of acceptance or justification. Now when the life of the soul has been forfeited through sin, it cannot be recovered by our own efforts, but only through His gift by whom it was originally bestowed. So that there would be no such cure for this evil as the analogy of the Christian covenant requires, unless God had 'left power to his Church to absolve sinners.' For by the Church's office, by the ministry of absolution, and the power of the keys, the relation of man to Christ is renewed, even as it was originally bestowed in holy Baptism."—*Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, pp. 358, 360, 361.

According to these extracts, the persons who compose the Church of Christ on earth, are those who have become one with Christ, as sharers of his humanity; and their participation in that humanity is first attained through the sacrament of Baptism,—is recovered, when forfeited by sin, by the absolution of the Church through the medium of its Ministers,—and then sustained by the sacrament of the Eucharist. But the Archdeacon says elsewhere, that "*both Baptism and the Eucharist are the means through which men's nature is communicated to his brethren, or, by which union with the body of Christ is bestowed upon men.*"\* "This divine nature distributes itself on the right hand and on the left; the two sacraments go together; their importance is equal, their effect alike."† The Holy Ghost is once mentioned, *by the way*, as accompanying the operation of the sacraments, when administered by those who are in the (so-called) "apostolical succession." But "the word of truth," or "the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever," of which James and Peter speak so expressly as being the instrument of our regeneration, (James i. 18; 1 Peter i. 23,) and "the Gospel,"

---

*Incarnation*," pp. 334, 335.

† *Ibid.*, p. 372.

through which Paul declares "the saints" at Corinth to have been "begotten in Christ Jesus," (1 Cor. iv. 15,) and the "faith" which "cometh by hearing," (Rom. x. 17,) and the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," of which Peter speaks as being essential to the experience of God's "elect," (1 Peter i. 2,) and the *personal* intercession of Christ,—are either absolutely ignored, or so eclipsed and kept out of sight, that the prime and commanding characteristics of the true Church-system, as being primarily spiritual and evangelical, are, in the practical result, if not in the antecedent intention, covered and lost in the single notion of its being "sacramental." In such descriptions of the Church, or of the persons who compose it, we look in vain for the apostolic original exhibited in the New Testament. The true spiritual portrait no longer appears, the canvas being covered all over with the glossy, but clouded, colouring and varnish of a *sacerdotal externalism*.

On this subject Mr. Litton offers the following most appropriate remarks:—

"They who on the Day of Pentecost 'gladly received the word' of Peter, promising them, on repentance, remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost,—that is, who repented and believed,—'were baptized.' This was the established order according to which 'the Lord added to the Church such as should be saved.' They were added thereto, not that they might be, but because they had been, previously, led to repent and believe; visible incorporation with the Church being the last, not the first, step in the order of salvation. The passage, indeed, teaches us that those whom the Lord designs to save, he will ordinarily add visibly to his Church; but not that salvation is the consequence of such union. Had the order of salvation been, in their (the Apostles') view, what the sacramentalist would have it to be, they would, in exhorting men to save themselves from the wrath to come, have directed them, in the first instance, and before any thing else, to the Church, as the divinely-appointed institution, through sacramental union, with which they were to be brought within the influence of Christ's saving power. But the course which they followed was altogether different. Christ himself—and not the Church of Christ—was the object which they placed in the foreground of their ministry, and to which the inquirer was, without the intervention of any thing else, directed. To the question, 'Sirs, what must I do to be saved?' the apostolic reply was not, 'Join thyself to the Church, through which thou shalt attain to Christ, and through Christ to God,' but, 'Believe upon the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' Whatever else might be necessary to perfect the Christian's union with Christ, the first step towards salvation was ever, according to the apostolic teaching, a direct application, upon the sinner's part, not to Christ's diffused manhood, the visible Church, but to Christ himself at the right hand of God."—Pp. 220, 221.

We have been the rather drawn to dwell on the Romanist and the Tractarian theories, as to the elements of which the Church is



composed, and the process by which those elements are aggregated and combined, because those theories lie at the root of the doctrinal errors by which their systems are respectively characterized; and because, further, the place which is assigned to them by their advocates, in point of order and importance, serves to distinguish them from all genuine Protestants. In Romanism, "the article of a standing or falling Church" is the Papal Church theory. In Protestantism, as was well observed by Luther, it is the doctrine of justification by faith. Let the former make good its teaching on the nature and authority of the Church, and the acceptance of every thing else in its peculiar teaching must necessarily follow. Or let the latter establish its doctrine of justification by faith; and, whether it establish its other doctrines or not, it virtually puts an end to all controversy, as to the doctrines which are distinctive of Romanism. Similar statements—*mutatis mutandis*—will apply to the case, as between *genuine* Protestants on one hand, and *Romanizing* Protestants on the other, one of whom does not scruple to say, that "the Church was guided by Divine wisdom to make the article of our Lord's real nature the criterion of her belief, the '*articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesie*.'"<sup>\*</sup>

The errors which have arisen, on the subject of the spiritual constitution of the Church of Christ on earth, will all be found to have originated in a one-sided, and in some cases almost exclusive, regard to one or more of the attributes or predicates, which make up the totality of its character. The Romanist, for instance, has selected, as the ruling object of his contemplation, the *unity* which is ascribed to it; and, at the same time, utterly mistaking the true nature of that unity as being "the unity of the *Spirit*,"—and looking at it through a coloured medium and in a detached form,—he has constructed for himself a definition of the Church, in which scarcely any thing but *his own* monstrous and rickety notion of unity is to be seen. "The Church," he says, "is the congregation of all persons professing the faith and doctrine of Christ, which is governed by *one*, (and next to Christ,) the supreme Head and Pastor upon earth."<sup>†</sup> "The first mark of the Church is unity;" and this is understood to mean,— "It has but *one* visible governor on earth, him who, as legitimate successor to Peter, fills the apostolic chair."<sup>‡</sup> The emphasis which is given to this visible and organic unity has rendered it, in fact, *the* point, and the only point, on which membership with the Church of Christ on earth has been made to depend. Hence, according to the authoritative teaching of the Tridentine Catechism, "there are but three classes of persons excluded from her pale,—infidels, heretics or schismatics, and

<sup>\*</sup> "Incarnation," p. 175.

<sup>†</sup> Dens' "Theology," vol. ii., p. 112.

<sup>‡</sup> *Catechismo, secondo il Decreto del Concilio di Trento*, pp. 85, 86.

excommunicated persons. With regard to the rest, however wicked and flagitious, it is certain that they still belong to the Church. And if, perchance, the life of any Prelate in the Church be vicious, let the faithful be assured that they are still, nevertheless, in the Church, nor is their power, on that account, at all diminished."\* And they are sins, or supposed sins, against *this unity*, that have ever been visited with the severest punishment. They have been the *only* things that, in Romanism, have lighted the fires of martyrdom, and created the dungeons and tortures of the Inquisition. At one period of its history since the Reformation, a similar error was committed, only with less fearful results, by the Church of England, in the vain and semi-Popish attempts which were made to establish Acts of Uniformity.

On another hand, such theologians as the "Archdeacon of the East Riding" look mainly at that aspect of the Church in which it wears a *sacramental* character. And on this aspect of it their gaze is so intent, that, judged from their writings, they would seem almost to have lost the power of seeing any thing but sacraments and the parties concerned, actively or passively, in their administration. The result is, that the two sacraments,—supposed, of course, to be in duly-authorized hands,—together with the occasional and most convenient intervention of priestly absolution, make up all that is required, on their principle, to a man's being a member of the Church of Christ.

By another class of writers, such as Robert Barclay, the Church is regarded, somewhat exclusively, in its *spiritual* aspect. And so, in their view, "the several worships both of Protestants and Papists are merely carnal and outward ceremonies and observations, and not the true spiritual and new-covenant worship of Christ."† "They are both begun, carried on, and concluded, in man's own natural will and strength, without the motion or influence of God's Spirit, and therefore may be truly performed, as to the matter and the manner, by the wickedest of men."‡ The sacraments themselves are set aside, as outward ordinances;—Baptism, on the plea that "there is but one baptism," and that "not a washing with or dipping in water, but a being baptized with the Spirit;"—and the Eucharist, upon the ground that "the contending for the use of bread and wine, as necessary parts of the Gospel-worship, destroys the nature of it, as if the Gospel were a dispensation of shadows, and not of the substance."§ Others, again, are disposed to regard the Church chiefly in its aspect as "an *election* of grace." And so, in their phraseology, "the whole Catholic Church is the whole mystical body of Christ, consisting of the elect which are purchased and redeemed by his blood;" and the fact, or the belief, or the hope of such election

\* *Catechismo, secondo il Decreto del Concilio di Trento*, p. 85.

† Barclay's "Apology for the True Christian Divinity," Ninth Edition, p. 358.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 388.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 458.

is the *central* point or idea in their system,—just as the “Incarnation,” on the supposition of its being the basis of Baptism and the Eucharist, and even of the Saviour’s intercession, is the “great objective fact” in the “sacramental system” of Archdeacon Wilberforce. After the same fashion of partial and exclusive thinking, some look at the *duties*—the practical obedience and morality—of the Gospel, in such a manner as to lose sight of its *privileges* of “righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,” and so turn out mere Pharisees. Others, in their admiration of its privileges, forget its duties, and so err in the opposite extreme of Antinomianism.

We like the two notions of a *central idea*, and a *great objective fact*, in the system of Christianity; not from any fancy of our own, nor from the general popularity of such expressions, but because they have countenance in the phraseology of Scripture, and are on that ground entitled to acceptance, in their meaning, if not in their form. By all means, let us have a *central idea* in connexion with that system. But where shall we look for it, with any reasonable prospect of so succeeding in our search, as to enlist the universal, or even the general, suffrage of our readers, in support of the conclusion at which we have arrived, as the result of our inquiry. The object of that inquiry, we humbly submit, is not to be found in any of the *attributes* which have been mentioned, or others which might have been mentioned, as belonging to the Christian system, and to the Church which constitutes its glorious embodiment,—not in its unity, or catholicity, or spirituality, or sanctity, or sacramentalism,—not in particular ordinances, or privileges, or duties,—but in *SALVATION*. That is the “*central idea*” of the Church,—the point from which every thing that is theoretical proceeds, and in which every thing that is experimental or practical ultimately terminates. A Saviour is its *author*, and *salvation* is its *end*. Let us also have a “*great objective fact*,” as well as a “*central idea*.” But let us not be misled in the selection of it; and, to avoid that failure, let us follow the guidance of Holy Scripture. In so doing, we shall very soon discover, that it is not the (supposed) fact of an *à priori* and unconditional *election*; not the *Incarnation*, or *Personal Life*, or *Resurrection*, or *Ascension*, or even the *Mediation* of Christ; but the *ATONEMENT* accomplished by his sufferings and death. This is the “*great objective fact*” of Christianity, to which all its other facts do homage. It was accordingly, in anticipation, the subject of our Saviour’s discourse, when Moses and Elias talked with him on the Mount of Transfiguration:—“He spake of his *decease*, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.” It was the object of attraction which he foretold should be set up, as that which would gather around him the faith and homage of a sanctified Church, and of a rebellious and ruined world:—“I, if I be *lifted up*,” (said he,

signifying thereby what *death* he should die,) "will draw all men unto me." It was the burden of his thoughts, and the goal of his anticipations, when he "dwelt amongst us:"—"I have a baptism"—a baptism of agony and blood—"to be baptized with: and how am I straitened, until it be accomplished!" It was the consummation of that which he had thus longed for, when he cried, "It is finished! and gave up the ghost." It was the predominant and absorbing theme of apostolical preaching:—"We preach *Christ crucified*, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God;"—"I am determined to know nothing amongst you, save Jesus Christ, and *him crucified*;" and "God forbid that I should glory, save in the *cross* of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is the ground of our redemption and justification; "for we have redemption through his *blood*, even the forgiveness of sins." It is the basal truth implied in the sacraments:—"As many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his *death*;" and, "as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do show the *Lord's death*, till he come." It is the foundation of our Saviour's mediatorial throne; for "he became obedient unto *death*, even the death of the cross; wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name;" and, "in the midst of the throne," stands "a Lamb, as it had been *slain*." It is connected with the condition and character of those who "are before the throne;" for they are noted as those who "have washed their robes, and made them white in the *blood* of the *Lamb*." And, finally, it is the theme of the "new song" in heaven:—"Worthy is the *Lamb* that was *slain* to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing for ever and ever."

The *external polity* of the Church is a subject on which there has prevailed a diversity of opinion, as great as that which has existed as to its spiritual constitution, or subject-matter. Not that there is any such diversity, as to the necessity of such a visible Church-order as is implied in the term "Church polity;" there being on this point hardly any difference at all between Papists and Protestants, any more than upon the Divine institution of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist; and very little difference amongst Protestants themselves. The statement made by Mr. Litton, that "it is not antecedently probable, that so important a matter would be left absolutely to the discretion of Christians, or that Christ would send his Apostles forth to found Christian societies throughout the world, without affording them *sufficient* guidance as to the manner in which such societies were to be organized,"\* may be readily accepted. But when it

---

\* Litton, p. 243

is added, that "it is reasonable to suppose that in some way or other, by the previous dispensations of his providence as the Eternal Word, or by positive enactments, he would make it clear, according to what *outward form of polity* Christian societies were to be constituted," we gravely demur, upon religious principle, to all such merely presumptive suppositions. We may very properly speculate on antecedent probabilities in a variety of cases; but when the Divine procedure is in question, in the absence of positive and certain revelation, we have a strong "antecedent" objection to the gratuitous assumption of any antecedent probabilities at all. The rather, as not only can such anticipations, from the very nature of the case, have no adequate foundation; but they are generally the reverse of what actually happens, and they involve, as we think, an offence near akin, in spirit at least, to that of seeking to be "wise above that which is written." We have further learned to regard such suppositions as having, in most cases, no other purpose or use, than that of bespeaking an indulgence, felt to be needful, to feeble or doubtful proofs, which are afterwards to follow. In this way they may help a labouring case; for, as Quintilian says, "Probabilities, though they are not sufficient of themselves to clear away doubt, are yet, when added to other proofs, of considerable avail."\* But it would have been more becoming the importance and sacredness of the point to be settled, if the argument from *probability* had been wholly omitted; especially as, in this instance, it has the fault of being an argument *ad verecundiam*.

Our business, in the absence of authentic revelation, is not to conjecture what God may be regarded as being *likely* to do in any given case, but to consider what he has *actually* done. That he would afford *sufficient* guidance, is absolutely certain; but what he deemed to be sufficient, must be gathered from the amount of guidance which he can be shown to have given. For positive information on this subject, we naturally look to his *practice* during the period of his being the visible Head and Ruler of his Church; and, in so doing, we find that he trained his Apostles and disciples to the use of the synagogue worship; and, excepting that he constituted the new and peculiar office of apostleship,—for a service extraneous to that of the synagogue, and, therefore, requiring a new and peculiar appointment,—there is no evidence at all, nor even a hint, of his having originated, by his direct appointment, any Church order or Church office whatever. Nor is it pretended that *their* appointment and office supply any model for the constitution of Churches, or even for the appointment of Ministers, after his death; their

\* "*Alia sunt signa, quæ cetera Græci vocant, quæ, etiamsi ad tollendam dubitationem sola non sufficiunt, adjuncta cæteris, plurimum valent.*"—QUINTIL. *De Orat. Institut.*, lib. v., cap. 9.



office not being necessarily of a *local* character, but having reference rather to the Church and to the world at large. And as his practice sheds no *new* light on the question of external order,—the order of the synagogue being, for the time, at least, sufficient for his purposes,—so, in his *teaching*, we look in vain for any *details* on the subject. That the question of the Church order, as to gradational rank, to be established after his decease, was, in the minds of his disciples, a subject of anxious curiosity and earnest discussion, appears upon the face of the evangelical record in the case of “Zebedee’s children,” (James and John,) who sought for themselves, through the medium of their “mother,” particular and prominent appointments in the new order of things, which they were led to suppose was about to be established. And it further appears in St. Mark’s account of the occasion on which the disciples, in the absence of their Master, yet not without his knowledge, “disputed among themselves which should be the greatest.” (Mark ix. 34.) These, surely, were occasions on which fair opportunity was given to him to enunciate his law, at least in that department of Church order which relates to a gradational scale of ministerial honour and service. But neither in these instances, nor in any other, did he judge it to be necessary, or at all to their advantage or that of the Church, to resolve their doubts, or to gratify their curiosity, on the particular points which had stirred up an interest so eager and ominous. With respect to the first of these cases, Mr. Barrett very justly observes:—

“The disciples had not understood our Lord to assert,” (in the discourse recorded Mark x. 35–45,) “that all his people hereafter in administrative acts were to be joined in a perfectly equal position. After referring to the baptism of sorrow and cup of trembling, which he and his followers must needs receive on founding that kingdom, Christ tells them thus with respect to the place of authority they aspired after, ‘It is not mine to give, but (except) for whom it is prepared of my Father,’—that is, There *shall* be persons holding a place to which deference is due; but the appointments shall take place under the joint administration of the Father and the Son, and in especial harmony with that of the Father. After asserting that there *should* be government in his Church, he proceeds to tell how the right to govern should arise, and how particular individuals should be invested with it. ‘Ye know that the *Princes* (ἄρχοντες) of the Gentiles exercise dominion over *them*, and the *great* (μεγάλοι) exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you,’ &c. The overseers of his flock should gain their authority and position, not by hereditary prescription and military force, but by moral and spiritual character, formed in a course of disinterested labour. The contrast is not between the harsh and the mild, but between the secular and the sacred. And the whole lesson is here, as elsewhere, that the oversight of Christ’s Church is not conformed, in spirit, form, or end, to the civil establishments of the world.”—*Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church*, pp. 67–70.

And as our Lord does not appear to have given any specific directions, on the point, as to details, previously to his decease, so neither is there any tangible fact or positive statement serving to prove that, amongst "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," of which he spoke to his Apostles after his Resurrection, any such directions were included.

But though it cannot be shown that our Saviour prescribed any particular form for the polity of the Christian Churches,—otherwise than as in his *practice* he adopted the type of the Jewish synagogue, as that in which it was sufficiently fitting and convenient that his Church, in its evangelical character, should have its *beginning*,—yet did he not fail to enunciate the *principles*, or primary grounds, on which distinct Churches should be afterwards in perpetuity established. One of these *principles*, namely, that of disinterested and unambitious *devotedness* to himself and to his Church, has already been mentioned. Other principles, which are obvious in his various discourses, are *purity*, *spirituality*, *fellowship*, *order*, *expansion*, and *peace*; the general "law of Christ," as given by himself, and interpreted by his Apostles, being understood to be the great master-principle which defines the meaning, and governs and directs the application, of them all.

Passing from our Lord to his Apostles, with a view to the discovery of any form of Church polity which *they* may have established under the guidance of the principles just mentioned, we look, first of all, at their *practice*, as we have already looked at the practice of their Master. On this subject, Mr. Barrett observes:—

"That there is the very highest probability that the organization of the Christian Church would be (was) formed on the model of the synagogue, is evident from the fact, (already stated,) that Christ trained his Apostles and disciples to the use of the synagogue worship; (Matt. xii. 9, *et alibi passim*;) that, after his death, they continued the practice, and defended themselves before that high court of appeal which all the synagogues acknowledged; (Acts iv. 7;) that, in large cities, they had not, for many years, any other accessible congregations than the Jews and devout Gentiles whom they might find in these places of worship; (Acts xvii. 2;) that these first converts were drawn from thence: (Acts viii. 8, &c.) and thus, as Archbishop Whately says,\* 'it appears highly probable,—I might say, morally certain,—that the synagogue was brought—the whole or the chief part of it—to embrace the Gospel. The Apostles did not, then, so much form a Christian Church (or congregation, *ecclesia*) as make an existing congregation Christian by introducing the Christian sacraments and worship, and establishing whatever regulations were necessary for the newly adopted faith; leaving the machinery (if I may so

---

\* "Kingdom of Christ Delineated," p. 88.

speak) of government unchanged; the Rulers of synagogues, Elders, and other officers, (whether spiritual or ecclesiastical, or both,) being already provided in the existing institutions.'"—P. 61.

It may not be convenient to Dr. Davidson to admit the correctness of this view, because, in the course of its practical application in detail, it interferes somewhat seriously with certain notions which he holds, as a Congregationalist, on the subject of Church discipline. But the objections which he urges are of little avail in answer to the host of opinions and arguments arrayed against him. We, therefore, agree with Mr. Litton, that the question has been "conclusively settled"—to the issue above stated—"by Vitringa, in his learned work (*De Synagoga Vetere*); and that, independently of the overwhelming amount of direct evidence to the effect that the synagogues constituted the pattern which the Apostles proposed to themselves, the simple facts, that the founders of the first Christian Societies were Jews, and that the first Christian Society came into existence at Jerusalem, seem of themselves decisive of the question."\* The point is argued by Mr. Litton, at length, in several of his succeeding pages.

The office of the Apostles, as has already been stated, was altogether a peculiar one, having no analogy with any thing found in the Jewish synagogues;—an office vouchsafed to the Church by Christ, under peculiar circumstances, for the purpose of founding and organizing Christian Societies, but never intended to be a permanent part of ecclesiastical polity. In the course of time, however, cases arose, chiefly from the multiplication of local Churches, which rendered it impossible for them to exercise, in all places and at all times, an effective personal superintendence. Under these circumstances, it became necessary—so it was, at least, in the case of St. Paul—to employ *Delegates*, or *Commissioners*, selected from the general body of believers, as being eminent for their natural and spiritual endowments; some of them being generally attached to his person, and accompanying him in his journeys. And of these persons one or more were dispatched to different places, to check heretical tendencies, and to correct practical abuses, or to assist in organizing Christian Churches. It was thus that Timothy at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, were empowered by him, in the capacity of Presbyters, "to ordain Elders (or Presbyters) in every city," and to exercise jurisdiction over officers of that class, as well as over those who held the lower office of "Deacons." But as to the notion entertained by ultra-advocates of Episcopacy, that there was a permanent appointment of a new class of officers analogous to that of the local Bishops of after-times, Mr. Litton observes:—

---

\* Litton, p. 255.

"Not only is there no positive evidence in all this, that St. Paul intended to create, in the persons of Timothy and Titus, a new ecclesiastical office, but there appear to be, in the Epistles themselves, express intimations that their (*peculiar*) commission was but a temporary one; to terminate, either when St. Paul should rejoin them, or should direct them to go elsewhere. Such, at least, is the impression conveyed by such passages as the following: 'These things write I unto thee, hoping to *come unto thee shortly*; but if I *tarry*, that thou mightest know how to behave thyself in the house of God,' &c. '*Till I come*, give attendance to reading,' &c. (1 Tim. iii. 14, 15.) The Apostle, apparently, was not able to fulfil his intention of rejoining them; and, accordingly, he urges both Timothy (in the Second Epistle) and Titus to dispatch, as quickly as possible, what remained to be done, and to repair, the former to Rome, the latter to Nicopolis: 'Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me; for Demas..... is departed unto Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia. When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis.' (2 Tim. iv. 9, 10; Titus iii. 12.) From the former of these passages we incidentally gather, that Titus's stay in Crete was, in fact, but short; for the Second Epistle to Timothy having been written either a little after, or at the same time as that to Titus, it should seem that the latter had, according to the Apostle's direction, joined him where he was residing, and by him had been dispatched on another mission; namely, to Dalmatia. With respect to this Second Epistle to Timothy, written, according to the most probable hypothesis, about a year after the First, and in the immediate prospect of martyrdom, it is to be observed, that there is no mention whatever in it of Timothy's being permanent Bishop of Ephesus, or, indeed, of his being in any way connected with that Church. That he was at Ephesus when the Epistle was addressed to him, we gather only from the probabilities of the case, and from the mention of Hymenæus and Alexander, (ii. 17; iv. 14,) who seem to be the same persons against whom Timothy is warned in the First Epistle. (i. 20.)"—*Litton*, p. 419.

To the names of Timothy, Titus, Demas, Crescens, Tychicus, and Artemas, may probably be added, as officers of the same class, Lucius, Silvanus, Sosthenes, Aristarchus, Marcus, Lucas, and Epaphras, though not all equally distinguished.\* The Scripture cases which are alleged in addition to those of Timothy and Titus, for the apostolical institution of the episcopal order, in the modern sense of that term,—such as the case of St. James at Jerusalem, and that of the "angels" of the Apocalyptic "Churches,"—yield nothing more than conjectural evidence. And so, on the whole,—

"Respecting the origin of the episcopal order, Scripture leaves us very much in the dark. No *order* of Ministers, other than these three,—Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons,—are mentioned in the New Testament, as forming part of the then existing polity of the Church. For every attempt to establish a distinction between the

\* *Litton*, p. 423.

Presbyter and the *Episcopus* of Scripture will prove fruitless; so abundant is the evidence which proves that they were but different appellations of one and the same office."—*Litton*, p. 412.

The Oxford Tractarians themselves admit, that it was not until "some period *after* John's decease," that the ministerial order was recognised under the three names of "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." At first, according to their showing, they were "Apostles, Elders, Deacons;" after the decease of some of the Apostles, but while John, at least, was yet living, they were "Angels, Bishops, Deacons," the office, or name, of "Presbyters" being wholly omitted.\*

The argument from *Scripture*, in direct *proof* of the apostolical origin of a formal episcopate, is thus, as it ought to be, fairly abandoned; and, so far, the question at issue between Episcopalians and their opponents may be regarded as being conclusively settled: or, if not, and any of Mr. Litton's friends disagree with him, it may very safely be left to be determined amongst Episcopalians themselves. It is enough for *our* purpose that the apostolicity of the *order*, as a matter of *fact*, wholly depends for its proof, even with some of its warmest advocates, upon post-apostolical testimony, of which, as well as on the question of its perpetual obligation, as necessarily resulting from adequate proof of such fact, we shall perhaps have something to say. For the present, we are satisfied to have it acknowledged, that the Apostles themselves have not recorded, nor has any one recorded on their behalf, any evidence approaching to proof, or even to moderate probability, of their having originated any precise form of Church polity. We are thus left to conclude, as we do, that, after the example of their great Teacher, they deemed it expedient rather to enunciate and urge general *principles* of action, accordant with his law, and applicable to *all cases* and *all times*, than to prescribe any settled and permanent rules, as to the details of Church order, to be universally and permanently binding.

"The remarkable circumstance is to be borne in mind, that not one of the appointments of the Apostles, in matters of polity, have (has) been transmitted to us in Scripture in the form of *legislative enactments*, but simply as *recorded facts*. For example, the inspired history informs us that, as a matter of fact, the Apostles ordained Elders for every Church; but no *law* upon the subject, purporting to emanate from the Apostles, can be found in Scripture. To their appointments the Apostles append no imperative declarations, making them immutably binding upon the Church. Let their mode of proceeding, in this respect, be compared with the mode in which the law was delivered, and the difference between the two cases will be apparent. The Mosaic appointments were not only recorded, but commanded; the apostolic regulations are recorded, but not made matter of law:

\* "Tracts for the Times," vol. i., p. 12.



the Apostles do not absolutely bind the Church, of every age, to follow the precedents they set. When we consider the natural tendency in the promulgators of a new religion to pursue an opposite course, we can only account for the mode of proceeding adopted by the Apostles, by the supposition of their being under a Divine guidance, which withheld them from what might have given occasion to the notion, that the *essential being* of the Church lies in the *polity*, which, under apostolic guidance, she assumed."—*Litton*, p. 441.

Thus, as Hooker has remarked, "although there be no express word for every thing in *specialty*, yet there are *general* commandments for all things, to the end, that even such cases as are not in Scripture particularly mentioned might not be left to any to order at their pleasure, only with caution that nothing be done against the word of God; and that, for this cause, the Apostle hath set down in Scripture four general rules, requiring such things alone to be received in the Church as do best and nearest agree with the same rules; that so all things in the Church may be appointed, not only *not against*, but *by and according to*, the word of God. The rules are these: 'Nothing scandalous or offensive unto any, especially unto the Church of God;' (1 Cor. x. 32;) 'All things in order and with seemliness;' (1 Cor. xiv. 40;) 'All unto edification;' (1 Cor. xiv. 26;) Finally, 'All to the glory of God.' (1 Cor. x. 31.)" \* In this respect, as in the other, it was "enough for the disciple to be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord."

Now, there is something so remarkable in this rigid abstinence, on the part of our Lord and the Apostles, from the authoritative deliverance of prescriptive rule or order in the external arrangement of ecclesiastical matters, especially when viewed in contrast with the scrupulous minuteness which characterized the arrangements of the preceding dispensation, that we are irresistibly impelled to the conclusion, that for a difference so striking there must have existed special and weighty reasons. Why so much exactness of detail in the latter case, and in the former scarcely any detail at all, but simply a system of general principles and maxims, left, as it were, to grow spontaneously into detail by the vigour of their own inherent life, as their own natural tendency and action, under the guidance of varying circumstances, might appear reasonably to require? In such a case, there appears to be no reason for a reserve so guarded, save on the supposition of some practical advantage, which, in their estimation, was thereby to be secured to the Christian Church, not only in their time, but throughout all ages. Nor does it seem difficult to arrive at something like the truth upon this subject. In the first place, as we have already had occasion to observe, to the Church in apostolic times, excepting the apostolical office, for which our Lord made adequate provision, so long

\* Hooker's "Eccles. Pol.," book iii., chap. viii., 1.

as he considered the peculiar functions of that office to be requisite, no form of Church arrangement, beyond that which was made ready to their hand in the arrangements of the synagogue, was considered to be *necessary*. And, secondly, aware, as they must have been, of the natural tendency of the human mind, in matters of religion, to attach undue importance to mere forms,—and especially to those which purport to have been established expressly on divine authority,—to the neglect of the great spiritual objects which such forms may have been intended to subserve, it must needs have occurred to them, as a matter of importance, that, so far as their reserve on the subject of external arrangements could preclude so great a mischief, it should be rigorously exercised. Unhappily, their cautious sagacity on this point has not been sufficiently regarded. At an early period after their decease, a system of Church-officers, suited, perhaps, to the advancing circumstances of the Church, and not inconsistent with the *principles* laid down by our Lord and his Apostles, was first established, in the exercise of an allowable discretion, but was afterwards *insisted* on, as being virtually, if not expressly, of divine authority and universal obligation. And the result of this usurpation—as it might, without impropriety, be called—of the Divine prerogative was, the growth, first, of a blind attachment to, and next, of a vain confidence in, mere forms; which forthwith proceeded to multiply details almost without end; and, with a rapidity of progress which is generally characteristic of the progress of great mischiefs, overlaid the spiritual glory and true power of the Church with a prodigiously magnificent, but ruinous, ceremonialism. Unhappily, we must needs add, the lesson taught upon this point by the history of ancient Churches, and by that of the Romish Church in particular, appears to have been lost on certain theologians of modern times. Like those whom they have chosen as their models, they claim, as the exclusive endowments of the ecclesiastical polity with which they are connected, (saving always the anterior privileges of the “Church of Rome,”) *jure divino* prerogatives, *apostolical succession*, *sacerdotal office and authority*, and *sacramental grace*. And, to the extent to which they have been able to persuade themselves and others of the justice of these claims, there has been the growth of a system of externalism, vain in itself, but, in their eyes and those of their disciples, so beauteous and sacred, as to have drawn them into a close resemblance to, and many of them into actual communion with, *that system* in which such externalism naturally has its most perfect and attractive development. Nor is this merely an accidental result. The *theological affinity* subsisting between avowed Romanists and Romanizing Protestants, of the class of Archdeacon Wilberforce and others, if it be only allowed free scope for its natural and legitimate action, must, sooner or later, bring the two parties together, as has already

been seen in numerous instances. His idea, that the Sacraments are the first, or rather the only, instruments of our union with Christ and Christ's humanity, stripped of the ambiguous language with which his enunciation of it is connected, is precisely that which the Romanists intend, when they affirm that the Church is the perpetual Incarnation of Christ upon earth.

"To say that Christ is present with us in and through the visible Church, is obviously to make the Church, (virtually,) to individuals, the Vicar and representative of Christ upon earth; and it is but taking one step further, in the same direction, to make the Church Christ himself. Such, in fact, is, in Romanism, the aspect under which the Church presents itself to 'the faithful.' Instead of being present in his word and by his Spirit, and offering himself as the direct means of access, on the sinner's part, to God, Christ is held to have retired from the personal administration of the kingdom of God, and to have delegated his powers—royal, priestly, and prophetic—to the 'visible Church,' (that is, the Clergy,) commanding all men to regard *it*, as they would have regarded *him*, had he been still among them in his human nature. In this one dogma the whole of the Romish system, doctrinal and practical, is contained."—"The embarrassments are endless, in which those who adopt this (the Archdeacon's) view of the Church—and yet stop short of fully developed Romanism—are involved."—"None but a Romanist can plausibly (consistently) maintain, or carry out to its legitimate results, the dogma that the visible Church is the perpetual incarnation or manhood of Christ on earth."—*Litton*, pp. 217, 218.

Our bosom heaves with an involuntary sigh, on the view of a dogma so startling, under the sanction of the much-honoured *name* which the Archdeacon wears as his rich but "perilous inheritance;" and we can scarcely refrain from exclaiming, "*Quantum mutatus ab illo!*" Yes, how changed indeed! We can almost imagine the *sainted* one uttering his warning, if he might only be heard, to the whole school of those whose course is so plainly towards the extreme of *ecclesiastical* parricide,—

*"Ne, pueri, ne tanta animis assuescite bella,  
Neu Matris validas in viscera vertite vires.  
Tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo:  
Proijce tela manu, sanguis meus!"*—

We shall not farther notice the volumes which have drawn forth these observations, than to say that the errors they contain are very lucidly exposed in the *Strictures* of Mr. Bird:—which we earnestly commend to the attention of our readers, and especially to those who are Ministers, or otherwise members, of the "Church of England," as containing a fair statement of the substance and tendency of the "sacramental system."

The distinction, made by Calvin, and maintained by Presbyterians, between *ruling* and *teaching* Elders, as constituting two separate classes or orders in the apostolical Churches,

is not admitted by any of the writers with whom we are dealing. We, therefore, willingly abstain from entering into that question, any farther than to say, that, in our judgment, there is no adequate scriptural warrant for any such distinction, and that the balance of proof preponderates greatly in favour of the generally adopted conclusion, that ruling and teaching were simply different functions of one and the same office; namely, that of Presbyters,—except perhaps occasionally, and in extraordinary cases.

As to the *general administration of Church affairs*, and the proper adjustment of lay and clerical influence, Mr. Litton is of opinion that such adjustment “depends upon the maintenance of *three important rules*, commended to us by apostolic precedent.” And in this he is, generally, followed by Mr. Steward, who believes that “co-administration on the part of the Church,” particularly when “headed by Pastors uninspired, must be a cardinal point in its polity.” “There are clearly no apostolic precedents,” he says, “for a pastoral theocracy in the Church; and as clearly none for the opposite theory, democracy. Church rule is neither the one nor the other, but *both* in balancing conjunction.”\*

The *first* of Mr. Litton’s “three rules” is “the free admission of the laity to the deliberative assemblies of the Church.” And his palmary argument in proof of it, as well as that of Mr. Steward, is drawn from “the precedent of the apostolic Council held at Jerusalem, which is assumed to be the model of such assemblies in after-ages. “In that Council,” says Mr. Litton, “‘the whole Church,’ consisting of Apostles, Elders, and brethren, came together for the purpose of deliberation; and the decree ran in the name of the whole community.”† Let us see what this precedent really amounts to, as it is given in the scriptural record.

“Certain men from Judea taught the brethren” (at Antioch), “and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.” Whereupon, “they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the *Apostles* and *Elders* about this question. And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received,”—ἀπεδέχθησαν, *admodum humaniter excepti*,‡ “were very kindly received or entertained”—“of the Church, and of the Apostles and Elders, and they declared” (it is not said *where*, but assuredly not at any *public assembly*; for that supposition converts the twelfth verse into a useless tautology) “all things that God had done with them. But there rose up” (it is not said *where*) “certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to

\* Steward, p. 190.

† Litton, p. 588.

‡ Schleusner *in voc.*

command them to keep the law of Moses.\* And the *Apostles* and *Elders* † came together (*συνήχθησαν*) to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing (amongst those who had come together), Peter rose up, and said unto them," &c. "Then all the *πλῆθος*"—"not *multitude*, but *assembly*—of *Apostles* and *Elders*, convened for the special purpose of considering this question" ‡—"kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul. And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me: my sentence (*κρίμα*) is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: but that we write unto them," &c. And as his "sentence" was, so the whole question was definitively settled,—and settled, so far as the *scriptural record* of this Council gives us any light upon the subject,—we would not say, *without the approval* of others, but—*by the authority* of the *Apostles* and *Elders* alone. So, we read in the next chapter, with reference to the conclusions adopted at this Council, that Paul and Timotheus, "as they went through the cities" almost immediately afterwards, "delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the *Apostles* and *Elders* which were at Jerusalem." The "decrees" having been ordained, as just stated, it only remained to determine the best mode of transmitting them to Antioch and elsewhere. And, with reference to this supplementary proceeding, "it pleased the *Apostles* and *Elders*, (in conjunction) with (*σύν*) the whole Church, to choose men from amongst themselves, and to send them (*ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι*) to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men (*ἡγούμενους*) among the brethren." (Acts xv.) The term *ἡγούμενοι*, applied to these two men, is generally agreed to be applicable to Presbyters or Elders only, there being no passage, so far as we know, in which it is applied to those who were Church-members only. In the thirty-second verse of the same chapter, Barsabas and Silas are expressly called "Pro-

\* "This opinion, it is plain, was given, not at a *public assembly*," (as Mr. Steward supposes,) "called for the purpose of considering the matter in question, but probably at a private meeting. The assembly denoted by *συνήχθησαν* was plainly another, called for the purpose of *deciding* on the question after due deliberation."—Bloomfield's "Greek Testament," note in loc.

† On this part of the narrative Calvin remarks, "*Non dicit Lucas totam Ecclesiam congregatam, sed eos qui doctrinæ et judicio pollebant, et qui, ex ratione officii, hujus causæ legitimi erant judices. Fieri quidem potest, ut coram plebe habita fuerit disputatio; sed ne ad tractandam causam vulgus promiscuè fuisse admissum quispiam putaret, Lucas disertè Apostolos et Presbyteros nominat.*"

‡ Luke does not say that the whole Church came together, but those who excelled in knowledge and judgment, and who, in *virtue of office*, were the legitimate judges of this matter. It is possible, indeed, that the discussion may have taken place in the presence of the *plebs*; but, lest any one should suppose that the multitude, promiscuously, were allowed to handle the matter, Luke names expressly the *Apostles* and *Elders*."—*Vide Comment. in loc.*

‡ Bloomfield's "Greek Testament," Comment on Acts xv. 12. See also p. 485, *infra*.



phets." And, from that circumstance, they would appear to have belonged to the class, before-mentioned, of apostolical Commissioners or Delegates. As such, to say nothing of their qualifications in other respects, they would, *in virtue of their office*, be entitled to attend and assist in the Council at Jerusalem; for, according to Neander, the appellation of *ἡγούμενοι*, as well as those of *προεστώτες* and *ἐπίσκοποι*, was often given to Presbyters.\*

To revert to the course which was taken for sending "the decrees" of the Council to Antioch, we incline to the opinion that the words, "in conjunction with the whole Church," may more properly be taken in connexion with the words, "to choose and send," than with the antecedent clause, "it pleased the Apostles and Elders." And in this we are glad to find ourselves supported by the judgment of a writer so candid and respectable as Mr. Barrett:—

"It is in the work of appointing chosen men," he says, "to be messengers, that the Church are joined with their Ministers; and it is when '*letters*' are written and transmitted, that '*the brethren*' send their greeting, together with that of the Apostles and Elders, 'unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia.' When the decrees themselves and their authority are alone regarded, it is the work of the ministerial college: when these decrees have to be attested to others, then the whole Church, or the brethren, are added.

"An exactly parallel case occurs in the superscription and sending of several of St. Paul's inspired Epistles. 'Paul, called to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, with *Sosthenes* our brother, unto the Church of God which is at Corinth,' &c.; (1 Cor.): 'Paul, an Apostle, and *all the brethren which are with me*, unto the Churches of Galatia;' 'Paul, and *Silvanus*, and *Timotheus*, unto the Church of the Thessalonians.' Now, it will not be doubted whether the matter of the Epistles, in all instances, be produced by the inspired wisdom of Paul alone,—whether he be the sole authority in any case. No one, in any age of the Church, so far as I know, has ever thought of laying to the account of the '*brethren*,' on the one hand, or of *Sosthenes*, *Silvanus*, or *Timotheus*, on the other, the authorizing, in whole or in part, of any doctrinal decision, or binding precept, addressed to the respective communions. The introduction of the brethren in the superscription was to signify that these had already received and believed the truths of which the Epistle treated; and now, by concurring with the Apostle in sending it through the medium of a bearer, they testified that this was the very teaching of Paul, and not some spurious production foisted upon them. And so with regard to the other Epistles: whether *Timotheus* and *Silvanus* had any degree of inspiration or not, is nothing to the point; the Epistles are held to be those of Paul. His co-Apostle, Peter, addressing all Christians, and therefore the Thessalonians, speaks of them as his: He, 'Paul, according to the wisdom given him, hath written to you.' (2 Peter

\* "History of the Christian Religion and Church during the First Three Centuries."

iii. 15.) They profess to be such, and contain this note of attestation in conclusion: 'The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epistle: so I write.' (2 Thess. iii. 17.) These Thessalonians appear to have been tampered with by a forged epistle, as from the Apostle, which enunciated deceptive doctrines respecting 'the day of the Lord.' (ii. 2.) Hence arose the necessity of having known witnesses to the genuineness and authenticity of apostolic communications; and the names of Timotheus and Silvanus, who were then with St. Paul, are therefore appended to the initial address. In this way, the superscription of the pastoral or synodical letter to the Gentile Churches (Acts xv.) is explained. The brethren were associated with the Apostles and Elders, as testifying to the truth and reality of the acts of these latter in council, and that this document was a faithful account of these decisions, and the recommendations thereon."—Pp. 323–325.

Mr. Steward asks,—“Could it have pleased the Church to accept the decree, and to concur in the Epistle, if it had been shut out from all participation in the matter?” Our answer is, that, with all his leanings to popular rights and lay-interference, Calvin himself simply admits, that it was *possible* that the *plebs* may have been present, as we have noticed already; but that “the modesty of the *plebs* appears herein, that, after leaving the judgment in the hands of the Apostles and the rest of the Doctors, they also subscribe to their decree.”\*

He appears also to suppose, that by the long paraphrase and comment in which he has enveloped the case in question, he has secured for his theory an in-expugnable position. But his defences consist, for the most part, of mere imagination, or of feebly-supported conjecture. By reasoning from doubtful probabilities and vague assumptions to unquestionable certainties, as he has done, it were no difficult task to bring out conclusions directly contradictory to those which he has adopted. But it is enough for our purpose, to have shown that he has failed to prove *his* thesis, chiefly from attempting to prove too much; if he has not, also, indirectly, given strength and cogency to the arguments, both from facts and from grammatical criticism, which are available against him. There is, however, one piece of criticism, to which it is clear he attaches particular importance, and on which, therefore, it were ungracious and unjust, not to bestow a little attention.

“Who can be meant,” he says, “by the phrase of ‘all the multitude who kept silence and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul?’ Are these Apostles, and Elders, too? The absurdity of such a supposition is but too manifest. The phrase ‘multitude,’ or ‘all the multitude,’ *never* bears such a meaning in the New Testament. It *always* means the people,—the mass, whether composing the Church, or the hearers of the word.”—P. 177.

\* “*Plebs modestia hinc colligitur, quod postquam Apostolis et reliquis Doctoribus iudicium permisit, nunc quoque subscribit eorum decreto.*”—Comment. in Act. xv. 22.

Of course, the meaning of this statement is, that, according to the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, the word *πλῆθος* cannot be applied to the bulk, or whole, of an assembly composed of Apostles and Elders only. Then, by parity of inference, neither can it be applied to the bulk, or whole, of an assembly composed of "Elders of the People, the Chief Priests and Scribes," only. But what is the fact? On referring to Luke's Gospel, from xxii. 66, to xxiii. 1, we read as follows: "The Elders (τὸ πρεσβυτέριον\*) of the People, and the Chief Priests and the Scribes, came together, and led Him into their Council." (συνέδριον ἑαυτῶν.) And, after having interrogated Him, in the manner stated by Luke, (vv. 67-71,) "the whole multitude of them," † (ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν,) that is, of the Elders of the people, &c., "arose and led Him to Pilate." Were these "Elders, and Chief Priests, and Scribes," the *people*—the *mass*, composing the Church, (or synagogue,) or the hearers of the word (or law)? So Mr. Steward's *dictum*, above cited, would determine; but with how much propriety, let himself be judge. And if Luke, in his Gospel, uses the word *πλῆθος*, as it is clear that he does, in the instance now mentioned, with reference to a council, or *synedrium*, in the proceedings of which the mass of the people had no share, why may not the same writer apply the same term to the "Council of Jerusalem," though consisting of Apostles and Presbyters only?

In thus dealing with the question in hand, we are not intending to deny, or even to question, the right of the laity "to be admitted to deliberative assemblies of the Church," but simply to deny the existence of any warrant of *clear scriptural authority* for the claim which is set up by Mr. Litton and Mr. Steward, on their behalf, of a "right to be freely admitted to *all*" such assemblies. Such denial, however, leaves room for very ample admission, that, on *other* grounds, there are many deliberative assemblies to which they have much more than an *equitable* claim to be admitted,—a claim which cannot be rejected, or even ignored, without serious error, and the probability of mischief to all parties concerned. We are disposed to go a long way in such admissions; and we are more than equally willing to concede, that, "in the management of the funds of the Church, the laity should have a part, either personally or by their representatives."

The *second* claim of Mr. Litton, on behalf of the laity, is, "that they should have joint rights with the Clergy in the appointment of Pastors." And he adds, that "the rule which

\* "Luke, in this passage, and in Acts xxii. 5, gives this name to the Sanhedrim. In Acts v. 21, he calls it ἡ γερουσία."—Bloomfield, *in loc.*

† "Render *πλῆθος* *cœtum*, 'assembly;' and by *αὐτῶν*, understand the Chief Priests and Scribes."—Idem, *in Luc. xxiii. 1.* See also Schleusner's "Lexicon," and Matt. xxvii. 1, 2.

Scripture furnishes on this point is, that no Pastor is to be placed over a Church, without its consent having been previously obtained thereto." In proof of this rule, he alleges the mode in which Matthias was appointed to supply the place of Judas Iscariot: (Acts i. 23-26:) "They (the disciples) appointed (*ἔστησαν*) two." But the word *ἔστησαν* does not mean, "they appointed," but "they *proposed* for election;" as it does also in the next instance cited, of the appointment of seven Deacons. (Acts vi. 2-6.) In both instances, this word describes the act of "the disciples," rendered by our translators, in the first, "appointed," and in the second, "set before." And there the act of the disciples ended. "Look *ye* out men whom *we* may appoint." With respect to the seven "Deacons," Mr. Litton very candidly adds, "that if, as some have thought, those who were appointed to office under that name were not Deacons, properly so called,—that is, as the term was afterwards understood,—but lay-administrators of the revenues of the Church, the transaction does not constitute a precedent for the principle in question." What their office really was, is tolerably clear from the statement which is made, that it was on the ground, that it was not reason that the Apostles should leave the word of God and serve tables,—that it seemed meet to the Apostles to "appoint" them "to *this business*." And, thirdly, he refers to the case of Paul and Barnabas, as "having ordained" (*χειροτονήσαντες*) "Elders" in the newly founded churches of Asia, (Acts xiv. 23,) on the ground—which may be very freely conceded—that, "although the word *χειροτονέω* is often used to signify the simple act of appointing, and does not necessarily mean, appointing with the consent of others, it is better, where there is no reason, as there is none here, for departing from it, to adhere to the natural and original signification of the word, which is, to appoint officers by means of suffrage."\* To these cases may be added that of the selection of the deputies who should carry to Antioch, and other Churches, the "decrees which were ordained by the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem."† To these Scripture testimonies, Mr. Litton adds "the weighty testimony of Clement of Rome," and an extract from one of the "Epistles" of Cyprian, both of which he regards as confirming the rule which he derives from scripture precedents.

We are inclined to think that the language of Cyprian has been sometimes unduly strained, by Mr. Litton and others, to a meaning which Cyprian himself never intended. His true meaning is to be gathered, not merely from any particular expressions, detached from the rest, but from a regard to those expressions *in connexion with the circumstances* by which the Letter was occasioned, and to which it mainly refers. What were those

\* Litton, p. 595.

† Cyprian, p. 172.

circumstances? Basilides and Martialis, Bishops of the Churches, officers, and people, (*plebs*), to whom the letter was addressed, had fallen into *sins so scandalous*, as to render it necessary that they should be deposed from their offices, and that others should be appointed in their stead. With reference to such appointments, Cyprian cites, in the first instance, the ordination of Eleazar, as successor to the priesthood, on the decease of Aaron his father; (Num. xx. 25;) and remarks that, by Divine direction, this ordination took place "in the sight of all the congregation," God himself intending thereby to show that "all ordinations of Priests should be made with the privity (*conscientia*) of the people (*populi*) standing by, in order that, in the presence of the *plebs*, (of the Church,) the *crimes of those who are wicked* may be uncovered, and the *merits* of those who are good may be set forth; so that the ordination may be just and legitimate, as having been tried by the judgment and suffrage of all." He next refers to the apostolical precedents already cited, and says that the ordinations or appointments, therein specified, were made "in the presence of the whole multitude (of the Church) assembled together, lest any *unworthy* person should creep into the service of the altar, or the place of the Priests." And then, with reference to the particular case in question, he adds, "Wherefore, in pursuance of Divine tradition and apostolical observance, there must needs be a diligent keeping and maintenance of the rule, which is kept amongst us also, and throughout almost all the ecclesiastical provinces; namely, that in order to the due celebration of ordinations, all the neighbouring Bishops, of the same province, should come together to the *plebs*, over whom a *præpositus* is ordained; and that a Bishop should be ordained in the presence of that people, which is fully acquainted with the *life* of each one, and has thoroughly seen his *practice* (*actum*) from his conversation."

The conclusion to be drawn from the Letter of Cyprian is, that the practice of *almost* all the Churches of his time was, to make appointments of Bishops, and other Church-officers, in the presence of the Churches specially concerned in such appointments; not so much on the ground of "joint *right*," as on the ground of its being a common *duty* on the part of the ordinary Bishops (or Presbyters) and the *plebs*, to take all possible precautions against the appointment of persons who might be defective in their *moral* and *religious* character; and that, this point being secured, the act of appointment, or ordination, was vested in the Bishops or Presbyters.\* Cyprian himself, in cases

\* Cyprian, Epist. lxvii. (Oxford Edition.) It may be added, "that in conformity with this practice of the Churches, the Emperor Alexander Severus, previously to his appointment of Governors, Prefects, and other officers to the Roman provinces, made a practice of publishing his arrangements, with the names of the parties proposed to be



where his own judgment and conscience were satisfied as to the eligibility of persons for the pastoral office, on the score of their general qualification and merit, made no scruple of ordaining them to clerical offices, even in the Church at Carthage, without any consultation of the people at all. "In clerical ordinations," says he, in a letter addressed to the Presbyters, and Deacons, and the whole *plebs* of that Church, "we are accustomed to consult you beforehand, and in common council to weigh the morals and merits of each; but human testimonies are not to be waited for, when there are Divine suffrages going before. Know, therefore, my very dear brethren, that he (Aurelius) has been ordained by me and by my colleagues who were present." \*

The *third*, and, in the opinion of Mr. Litton, the most important of the rights which belong to the laity, "relates to the exercise of discipline." And he adds, "That this power of inflicting Church censures is to be vested not in the clerical body alone, rests on the clearest evidence of Scripture. It is the whole Society, under the Presidency of its Pastors, that is to adjudicate upon the case, and pronounce sentence." In proof of these statements, Mr. Litton first adduces the oft-cited directions given by our Lord with reference to a certain particular case, "If thy brother trespass against thee," &c. (Matt. xviii. 15-17.) In the case which he supposes, the complainant, on the failure of all reasonable *private* attempts to obtain satisfaction for the "trespass" committed, is directed to "tell it to the Church." "The meaning of Christ is plain: that he who has offended, and has been in vain reproved by 'two or three,' is to be reported to all the members of the Church, in order that they all—not, certainly, the Elders of the Church alone—may, according to their ability, instruct, admonish, and restore him to the right way. For this duty is committed to all the faithful, to take care of those who are in error."† But let the term "*Church*," in this instance, mean what it may,—for ourselves we have no great objection to its meaning all the Church, only not in its *collective* capacity,—where is the intimation of its having any call "to adjudicate upon the case," or "to pronounce sentence?" The very terms used by our Lord plainly assume the

appointed; remarking, that, 'inasmuch as the Christians and Jews followed this practice, it would be a hard case if the same thing should not be done on the appointment of Governors.'—*Note*, by Rigaltius.

\* "In ordinationibus clericis solemus vos antè consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare; sed expectanda non sunt testimonia humana, cum procedunt Divina suffragia.—Hunc igitur, (Aurelium,) fratres dilectissimi, à me et à collegis qui præsentes aderant, ordinatum sciatis."—*Ibid.*, Epist. xxxviii.

† "Sensus enim Christi clarus est, eum qui peccavit et frustra correptus est à duobus aut tribus, indicandum esse omnibus Ecclesiæ membris, ut illum omnes (non certè soli Presbyteri Ecclesiæ) pro sua facultate instruant, admovent, et in viam rectam reducant. Est enim hoc officii demandatum omnibus fidelibus, ut errantium curam habeant."—Vitringa, *De Synagoga Vetere*, lib. i., p. i., cap. ii.

*fact* of the trespass; and, on the supposition of the offender's finally refusing to "hear the Church," He himself pronounces the sentence, if such it may be called,—“Let him be to *thee*” (the party complaining)—not necessarily or immediately to the Church—“as a heathen man and a publican.” “Of the Church, (in its corporate form,) nothing here is required. In respect of it, the *offending* brother would suffer no loss of privilege, nor would he be excommunicated by it. Christ simply directs that the brother who is *injured* or *offended*, should avoid familiar intercourse with the trespassing or offending brother until he has obtained entire satisfaction.”\*

The next instance mentioned by Mr. Litton in support of his theory of the rights of the laity in disciplinary matters, is that of the incestuous Corinthian. (1 Cor. v.) Of this case he speaks, as being one “from which may be gathered the rule which the Apostles prescribed to themselves.” But, unhappily for his argument, as we shall presently see, he *first* lays down his rule, and *then* deals with the example, from which it “may be gathered.” That rule, as he gives it, is as follows:—

“To the presiding Bishop, or Elders, it ordinarily appertains to pronounce and carry out the decree of expulsion: and, as long as the legislative power resides in the whole Society,—so that no decision in matters of discipline can be come to without the consent of the people,—there is no danger in permitting the clerical body, as a particular member of it, to be the organ of the community in promulgating its decree.”—Pp. 596, 597.

Now, in accordance with this rule, it was to have been expected that the whole Society at Corinth would meet together, to examine and decide upon the case in question, both as to the verdict and the sentence; and that, the Apostle not being able to attend in person, they would transmit their judgment to the Apostle, for the purpose of its receiving his official sanction. Or, supposing, as was the fact, that, instead of dealing with the case, they should be “puffed up,” and not rather mourn that he that had done this thing might be taken away from among them,—did not the rule, as laid down by Mr. Litton, require that, besides urging them to disciplinary proceedings, the Apostle should suspend his judgment, and wait for their decision, and *then*, adding his own vote, (if he had any,) should be, personally or by letter, “the organ of the community in promulgating and executing its decrees?” The rule stated, assuredly, required all this. But what was the Apostle's actual procedure? Does he give to “the whole Society,” or to any other parties, directions to judge and

\* “*De Ecclesiâ hic nihil repetitur. Ejus respectu, frater lædens nullam pateretur diminutionem, nec ab eâ excommunicaretur: sed id tantum monet Christus, ut frater læsus vel offensus familiariorem lædenti aut offendenti conversationem vitaret, donec sibi penitus esset satisfactum.*”—*Ibid.* (The opinion of Selden, quoted with approval by Vitringa, lib. i., p. i., cap. ix.)

determine the matter? No; not at all. He simply gives them his own decision, to be considered as being given by himself, on their "being assembled together,"—as "being present in spirit, though absent in body,"—and he concludes with the following charge, "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person." The "rule" and the example are at variance with each other. This Mr. Litton very plainly feels; and so, to compromise the matter, says that the Apostle, in acting as he did, was "super-seding, apparently, for the time being, the regular authorities of the Church:" in other words, on the showing of Mr. Litton, the case at Corinth is at the same time a *rule*, and yet, in the *main* points, an *exception*, too!—and the reader may take it to be either a rule, or no rule, as his own discretion may determine. We ought to add, that for putting us into this dilemma he makes ample amends by the following observation in another part of his work:—

"It must be remembered that this person (the incestuous person at Corinth) was, when St. Paul wrote, no longer regarded by him as even in visible communion with the Church, the Apostle having 'judged already concerning him who' had 'so done this deed, to deliver such an one to Satan;' and the sentence of excommunication subsequently pronounced by the Church being but the ratification of that which had previously issued from St. Paul."—*Litton*, p. 303.

That the excommunication of the offender should afterwards have been spoken of (2 Cor. ii. 6) as a "punishment" ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων, does little towards deciding the point at issue, as to the *authority* on which that punishment was decreed; whether we say it was "*of many*" (as the authorized English version has it) or "*by the means or instrumentality of many*," according to the sense which the word ὑπὸ bears in Rev. vi. 8, and elsewhere. All that is *certain* on *this* point—so far as the *record* guides us—is, that this communication was, on the part of the Church, an act of submission to apostolic authority, plainly indicated so to be by the Apostle's own words: "For to this end," says he, "did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye be *obedient* in all things."

Before quitting this case, we must allow Mr. Litton an opportunity of again explaining and correcting himself, as to what he holds to be the relative position of Ministers and laymen on disciplinary matters, especially in extraordinary cases:—

"It cannot be denied," he says, "that Scripture, far from making the Ministers of Christ the mere organs of the Church, every where invests them with an independent and effective authority. They are described as 'leaders' of the flock, to whom obedience is due; as 'over-seers' of the Church of God; and the charges given to Timothy and Titus, in their simple ministerial capacity, to 'rebuke sharply,' to 'command and teach,' and to 'reject' the contumacious and self-willed, prove that authority of no contemptible kind was committed to their hands.

Not unfrequently, indeed, the circumstances of the times were such as to call for, on the part of the Bishop, the most rigorous exercise of the prerogatives of his office conferred upon him, in order to prevent the Church from becoming a scene of anarchy and disorder."—Pp. 587, 591.

There is yet another instance (in Acts xxi.) in which Mr. Steward imagines that he has discovered "an incidental notice of Church practice in exact accordance with" his views of the preceding instances, as to the participation of "the multitude" of the Church in every department of Church rule. We should scarcely have thought the case worthy of being noticed at all, but that his treatment of it furnishes a singularly striking example of the way in which a mind warmed with a new theory takes the most trifling things for proof, just as a piece of amber or glass, *recently* rubbed, takes up very small particles, and adheres to them with a tenacity inversely proportionate to their weight.

It appears, from the chapter referred to, that, on the arrival of Paul and his companions from Cæsarea, "the brethren" at Jerusalem "gladly received them. And, on the day following, they went in unto James; and all the Elders were present." No other persons are mentioned; nor is there any, the remotest, intimation that any others were there. Having delivered his report, which was well received, especially as it was accompanied (according to Acts xxiv. 17) "with alms to his nation, and offerings," he was informed that, in consequence of certain rumours to his disadvantage,—as though he "taught the Jews among the Gentiles to forsake Moses,"—there was reason to fear, that a commotion might arise amongst the "many thousands of Jews which believed, and were all zealous of the law," so soon as they should "hear that Paul was come." It was not yet generally known amongst them; but, on its being so known, "the multitude," they said, "must needs come together," (A.V.) πάντως δὲ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν. In commenting upon this narrative, and especially upon the passage last quoted, Mr. Steward remarks,—

"The only point of interest here is the allusion that occurs of (to) the coming together of the Church to sift these, as soon as it should have been ascertained that Paul was come. This notice of the Church, as of necessity to be gathered together on this occasion, is *decisive* as to its general practice, and of its unquestioned right to convocate whenever it saw good, as well as to take part in the business which had brought it together: no more need be said."—P. 191.

Mr. Steward, indeed, has said quite enough. But the want of the article (τὸ) before πλῆθος is, in our judgment, fatal to his view of the case. And in this particular objection we find our-

selves supported by Priceus and Rosenmüller;\* and, if we are not mistaken, by Dr. Bloomfield also. The latter says: "Piscator, Beza, and Grotius understand this (πλῆθος) of a regular *convocation of the people*, as contradistinguished from the *Presbyters*. But all the best recent commentators seem right in determining the sense to be, 'It is unavoidable but that *a*—not *the*—multitude should flock together.' Δεῖ, like ἀνάγκη, often denotes what *must and will happen*." Further, as cited by Kuinoel, (*in loc.*) Heinrichs is of opinion, that πλῆθος has reference not to "a church-assembly (*cætus*) to be convoked by the Apostles," but simply to a *concourse* of the multitude. And the issue of the matter, notwithstanding the precaution taken against it, was what "James and all the Elders" had apprehended, as being unavoidable,—a riotous mob. "When the seven days (of purification) were almost ended, the Jews which were of Asia stirred up all the people, and laid hands upon him, and all the city was moved, and in an uproar," and Paul narrowly escaped with his life! (Acts xxi. 27–31.) If the practice of the Churches, and the meaning of the passage in question, were such as he supposes them to have been, how is it that there is no mention of any formal convocation of the *plebs* of the Church on this occasion? And where was the "*balance-principle*," with "*its working equilibrium*," all this time?

The directions of Christ, and the practice of the apostolical Churches, are thus seen to avail but little, if anything at all, in favour of the principle, or "rule," in support of which they have been so strenuously pleaded. We may now proceed to refer to the views which are suggested by the practice of the Synagogue, on the platform of which the early Churches were established. On this point, Mr. L. first assumes that our Saviour's direction (Matt. xviii.) is to be interpreted, as "conferring the power of excommunication, not upon the Pastors of the Church only, but upon the *whole body* of Pastors and people;" and, secondly, he states that, in so doing, he "merely turned to a Christian use the well-known existing practice of synagogical excommunication."—P. 201. His assumption, on the first point, we have already shown to be groundless; and equally groundless, we are now prepared to maintain, is the assumption which he makes, in reasoning on the supposition that the power of excommunication was vested in the *whole body* of the people composing the Synagogue. His statement on this point purports, indeed, to rest on the authority of Vitringa;† but, on examining the passage to which he refers, we find that the testimony of Vitringa is so far from being in accordance with that of Mr. Litton, that it is even directly contrary to it. "Let us now see," says

\* "Quia ante πλῆθος articulus deest, non malè conjicit Priceus, concursum potius quàm convocationem denotari."—Rosenmüller, *Comment. in loc.*

† *De Syn. Vet.*, lib. iii., p. i., cap. ix.



Vitringa, "who were the persons with whom, in the Jewish Church, was lodged the power of exercising this act. The Canons of the Hebrews every where assign *public excommunication*\* to the בית דין 'House of Judgment,' or 'Synedrium,'" by which, he says, we are to understand the judicial Presbytery ("*Senatum judiciale*").† It is, in fact, one of the main objects of Vitringa, in the chapter to which Mr. Litton refers, to prove, not only that "Christian excommunication has its origin from the Jewish," but also that "the act of excommunication" belonged of right to the Rulers of the Synagogue." ‡

Having thus examined the scriptural, Judaical, and patristic authorities, which have been supposed to justify, or rather to demand, the "three rules" laid down by Mr. Litton, in favour of the rights of the laity in Church affairs, we have only to add, with reference to him, that whilst we reject the fallacies which we have shown to exist in some parts of his reasoning, we yet agree with him in many of his conclusions; and that, on the whole, as a statement of the case between Romanists and Protestants, his work is entitled to our hearty commendation.

And here we should be willingly content to leave the matter, having ourselves very small relish for ecclesiastical controversy, and being inclined to believe that our readers, in general, are not disposed to go into such matters to any greater length than that to which we have already carried them. But two of the writers named at the head of this Article, have made special reference to the ecclesiastical polity of the Wesleyan Body. It seems, therefore, to be incumbent upon us, in fulfilment of one of the pledges contained in our Prospectus, to take some notice of that polity, and particularly of the strictures which one of those writers has made upon it; with a view to its being shown what that polity *really is*, and how far it agrees with so much of the theory, just now examined, as may be fairly admitted.

First, then, let us look at the general administration of Church affairs, including participation in deliberative assemblies, and the management of Church funds. It should be understood, that those portions of the country which are occupied by the Wesleyan Connexion, are geographically divided into *Circuits*, each portion including some city or town, (or a part of such city or town,) with a number of neighbouring towns or villages; and also into

\* As distinguished from the *private* excommunication referred to in Matt. xviii.

† "*Videamus nunc secundo loco, penes quos in Ecclesiâ Judaicâ resederit potestas hujus actus exercendi. Hebræorum Canones excommunicationem publicam adscribunt בית דין, Domui Judiciæ, sive SYNEDRIO. Receptum est, eâ dictione vulgò innui Senatum Judiciale; nec aliter hic sumendum existimo.*"—*De Synagoga Vetere*, lib. iii., p. i., cap. ix. (Ed. Franquera, 1696, p. 744.)

‡ "*Nobis nunc stat propositum, 1. Quadam eorum quæ Seldenus aut præterit, aut singularem animadversionem merentur, relegere. 2. Excommunicandi actum signatiâs vindicare τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν. 3. Ostendere, excommunicationem Christianam ortum suum trahere de Judaicâ.*"—*Ibid.*, p. 730.

*Districts*, each District comprehending a number of Circuits. In each Circuit, in addition to one or more Ministers, there are two Circuit-Stewards, several Society-Stewards, and a large number of Leaders of Classes; all these (with rare exceptions in the case of Leaders) being of the *laity*. For the transaction of business, in the various Societies belonging to each Circuit, including the distribution of the Poor's Fund, as well as other matters more directly spiritual, there are weekly meetings of the Stewards and Leaders of each Society; and there is a Quarterly-Meeting, consisting of the several Stewards and Leaders in the Circuit, together with a number of Trustees of Chapels and Local Preachers,—all of the laity,—to deal with the *finances* and *general interests* of the Circuit. And, in addition to these, there may be Special Circuit-Meetings, for special emergencies. There are, further, two Meetings in each year, of all the Ministers of the District, at both of which all the Circuit-Stewards and District-Treasurers of Connexional Funds (who are always laymen) have a right to participate, in the transaction of financial business. All these are administered by Ministers and laymen, in conjunction, a layman being always one of the Treasurers of each such Fund. The laity are not admitted to the Annual Meeting of Ministers, composing the Conference; it having been understood from the beginning, and it being the practice to this day, that its business is almost wholly restricted to examinations of ministerial character, to the settling of ministerial appointments, and other matters of minor, though necessary, detail, together with the confirmation of the proceedings of the *mixed* Committees of Ministers and laymen, held immediately before the Conference. *Occasionally*, only, it proceeds to *legislative* acts; such acts, however, being not considered to be absolutely binding in the first instance, but being left open to objection and appeal, on the part of the Societies. In cases of *special importance*, they are submitted beforehand to large meetings of Ministers and laymen, in conjunction, invited from all parts of the Connexion.

With respect to the *second* item in Mr. Litton's enumeration of the rights of the laity; namely, their "joint rights with the Clergy in the appointment of Pastors," and, we will add, in the appointment of other Church-officers; the following is the settled practice of the Wesleyan body. No person can be appointed to the office of Leader, or Society-Steward, or Poor's-Steward, but with the expressed concurrence of the Leaders'-Meeting; nor to the office of Circuit-Steward, but with a similar concurrence on the part of the Circuit Quarterly-Meeting; nor to that of a Local Preacher, without the concurrence of a Local Preachers'-Meeting. No man can be received even as a *candidate* for the office of a Pastor, but on the previous recommendation of the Quarterly-Meeting of the Circuit to which he belongs. In all these cases,

it is true, the nomination is with the Ministers; but the power of accepting or rejecting—Cyprian's *potestas vel eligendi vel recusandi*—is with the laity, who almost exclusively compose the meetings at which the various nominations are made.

Mr. Litton's *third* and last point, on the rights of the laity, relates to their participation in "the exercise of *discipline*," particularly in cases of expulsion from Church-office, or Church-membership; or, as he chooses to call it, excommunication. The latter term is not current in the phraseology of the Wesleyan body, because, in its ordinary acceptation, as being equivalent to implying a separation from even the visible Church of Christ, it involves much more than is necessarily and in all cases involved in *their* idea of "expulsion from the Society." With respect to the exercise of discipline on the lay-members of their Societies, their practice is as follows. In case of complaint against any member, he is thereupon summoned to appear before the Leaders'-Meeting, and, whether he attends or not, that Meeting constitutes the Court of hearing, the lay-officers present—together with such Ministers of the Circuit as may also be present in addition to the presiding Minister—acting in some sort as jurors, with the exception that they are not previously "sworn," their religious principle being held to constitute a sufficient obligation to fidelity, and that they are not required to be unanimous in their verdict. The innocence or guilt of the accused party having been decided, not merely as to the facts of the case, but also as to the bearing which the "law of Christ," and the settled Rules of the Society as being in harmony with that law, may have upon the facts, the censure, or sentence, in case of a verdict against those accused, rests with the Pastor. But, that he may not act precipitately, he is required to suspend his judgment for one week, at least, and, in the mean time, to take counsel privately, not only with members of that Meeting, but with others beyond, leaving, however, both to the party accused, and to the Pastor, the right of appeal to the District-Meeting and Conference, if either the one complain of an unfair trial, or the other of being hampered by a verdict palpably at variance with facts. Further,—

"Against a sentence of expulsion pronounced by the Superintendent, after the verdict of a Leaders'-Meeting, the Regulations adopted by the Conference of 1835 give to every member the right of appeal to a Minor District-Meeting, of which he may select two—that is, one-half—of the members or jurors. And, in 1852, with the unanimous sanction of a large number of laymen from all parts of the country, it was provided, with reference to *extraordinary cases*, that, should there be dissatisfaction, on either side, with the verdict of a Leaders'-Meeting, then, before the appeal goes to the superior tribunals, there shall be a re-hearing of the case before a jury of twelve persons, (laymen,) to be chosen by the Quarterly-Meeting (consisting of laymen)

of the Circuit in which the offence occurs, and a new verdict taken; in order that this wider appeal to persons more likely to be dispassionate and disinterested may have the effect of bringing the case to a speedier and more satisfactory conclusion; so making the appeal to the District-Meeting and the Conference, which is the final authority, only a last resource. It is also provided, that, where a Trustee of a chapel is accused, the co-Trustees of that chapel, being members of the same Society, shall, in the case of a trial, meet with the Leaders, and take part in the verdict. The 'Leaders' have a right, likewise, of declaring any candidate for admission into the Societies unfit to be received, after which declaration the person is not received. Office-bearers, as 'Leaders' and 'Local Preachers,' have the right of objecting to the introduction, among themselves, of persons whom they may deem unfit, or with whom they may not be disposed officially to associate; as, also, of deliberating mutually in reference to the discharge of their mutual duties, and of deciding on the fault or delinquency of those who are accused of neglect, or any other fault involving the liability of removal from office. And, finally, if the majority of the Trustees, or the majority of the Stewards and Leaders of any Society, believe that any Preacher appointed for their Circuit is immoral, erroneous in doctrine, deficient in abilities, or that he has broken any of the Rules (of Pacification, made by Ministers and laymen in 1797), they shall have authority to summon the Preachers of the District, and all the Trustees, Stewards, and Leaders of that Circuit, to meet in their chapel. The Chairman of the District shall be President; and every Preacher, Trustee, Steward, and Leader shall have a vote. And, if the majority of the Meeting judge that the accused Preacher is immoral, erroneous in doctrine, or deficient of ability, or has broken any of the Rules referred to, he shall be considered as removed from that Circuit; and another shall be appointed in his stead."—*Barrett*, pp. 348-351.

These are the facts of the case. For the present, we make no comment upon them, but leave them to speak for themselves; simply requesting our readers to compare these facts with the statements contained in one of Mr. Steward's most elaborate and eloquent comments on the ecclesiastical system to which they belong:—

"Methodism," he says, "in *every* thing belonging to its government and action on the people, is *simply* a machine formed and worked by the Pastorate *alone*. *Every* spring and power of it are actuated by the Pastorate,—*every* right and privilege emanate from the Pastorate,—and are held by this *one* tenure. The Pastorate keeps the keys of *every* apartment of this great house; and its escutcheon is impressed on *all* and *every* thing it contains,—on *every* ordinance and function set up there for its order and maintenance. It grasps the members of its own fellowship and of the Church with *equal* force, and disposes of a man's commission to teach and preach, or to hold membership in the Church, WITHOUT ANY POPULAR SUFFRAGE OR INTERFERENCE WHATEVER."—*Introduction*, pp. xxvii., xxviii.

For ourselves, on reading so astonishing a statement, we pause for a moment to take breath. And, having recovered ourselves a little, we go over the statement a second time. And as we proceed with it, sentence by sentence, we venture to ask, In the machine of Methodism, does *no* layman assist, either in forming or working any of the parts or details of which it is composed? Is there *no* spring or power which laymen actuate? *no* privilege or right which emanates from *them*? Is there *nothing* it contains impressed with their escutcheon? Have they *nothing* at all to do with the origination and management of the Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary Society, or of the Theological Institution, or the System of Sabbath and Week-day Schools, or the Training College at Westminster, &c.? Is there *no* key of *any* apartment, in the house kept by a *layman*, either alone or in conjunction with others? Have they *nothing* to do with the selection of the persons who compose the Pastorate? May men become Pastors *without* them? and then, for aught that *any* layman can do, preach, and live, and govern, just as they list? and is there *no* opportunity, on the part of the laymen, to interfere with their *doctrine*, or *morals*, or *rule*? Is there "no lay (or popular) interference whatever," on the question of Church-membership, or on the appointment of Church-officers? Have they *no* share in the government of the body? Does Methodism allow them *no* suffrage on the question of law-making and rule? and do they take *no* part in the charge and administration of Connexional Funds? And are they *never* consulted, either before or afterwards, in any of these matters? One question more: Can Mr. Steward deny any *one*—and, much more, can he deny *all*—of what we have stated, a little before, as the facts of the case? If he can, let him do so. If not, in deference to the "balance-principle," we will abstain from pronouncing any positive judgment of our own, and will just leave it to the *πλήθος* of our readers—with whom it is for our advantage, as well as for that of the public, that we should continue on good terms—to determine for us, whether the comment we have quoted from Mr. Steward's Introduction, is not a species of misrepresentation, for which *hyperbole* is rather too gentle a name. We will, at the same time, and on the same principle, leave them to say, whether "Methodism, as it is," deserves the brand of "Ultramontaniam," which Mr. Isaac Taylor, for lack of better information,—and others, from defects of a more serious character,—have attempted to stamp upon it.

As to the discipline farther exercised by the Conference on its own members, its practice is assuredly, at all events, not "Ultramontane." The Popish authorities, it is well known, reserve the *severity* of their discipline for the *plebs*, the Clergy enjoying the indulgence of a more lenient inquisition; whereas the Wesleyan Ministers are all annually subjected to scrutiny on every thing



relating to their personal and ministerial character, with a strictness beyond any thing which is used towards private Church-members. We question whether any other religious body has a guarantee equal to that which this practice secures for the purity of its Clergy. And he must be a bold, and not very wise, theorist, who would seek in any way to alter it.

To return, for a short time, to Mr. Steward's "Principles of Church Government," we are delighted with the *mottos*, from Cicero\* and Shakspeare,† which face the table of "Contents," and cannot but think that, if he had kept them in view through the whole of his volume, he would probably have been saved from very much of the confusion and mistake into which he has fallen. Instead of doing this, unhappily for his subject and for himself, he has exchanged the *musical* illustration which they supply, and which is admirably fitted for his theme, for a *mechanical* one, which is altogether out of place, and which misleads and hampers him almost all the way through. He is evidently a man of gentle spirit, poetical taste, and warm fraternal sympathies; so much so, that it grieves us to be compelled to differ from him so widely, as in justice to the subject we are constrained to do. And if he must needs excogitate a theory out of an illustration, we are quite sure, that himself and his subject would have been much more at home in Music, than in Mechanics. Would, therefore, that he had kept to his two elegant and most appropriate *mottos*! In that case, he might have shown, in his own vivid and powerful style, how the strings of each *fides*, and all the *tibiæ*, should be attuned to the New-Testament *pitch*, not to that of the Parliament, or the politico-religious public of this country, or to that of any earthly Government whatever:—how the *harmony* intended is produced, when each of the strings and pipes keeps to its own part, whether it be *alto*, *tenor*, or *bass*; and all, with the same object in view, (for they are all sup-

\* The passage, as it appears in the *motto*, is only *part* of a sentence, (to be found in St. Augustin, *Cir. Dei*, lib. ii., cap. 21.) and, of itself, is hardly capable of grammatical construction. The *whole* passage, as it stands in the "Fragments" of Cicero, is as follows: "*Ut in fidibus ac tibiis, atque cantu ipso ac vocibus, concentus est quidam tenendus ex distinctis sonis, quem immutatum ac discrepantem aures erudita ferre non possunt, isque concentus ex dissimillarum vocum moderatione concors tamen efficitur et congruens,—sic ex summis et infimis et mediis interjectis ordinibus, ut sonis, moderata ratione civitas consensu dissimillarum*" (not *dissimiliorum*) "*concinit; et quæ harmonia à musicis dicitur in cantu, ea est in civitate concordia.*" "As, in instruments that go with strings or wind, or as in voices consoled, there is a certain unison, from distinct notes, the least alteration of which is harsh and intolerable to skilful ears, and this unison, though made up from the effect of very different sounds, is yet rendered concordant and congruent; so, from the highest and lowest and intervening orders, as from so many sounds, a city governed by reason, by the agreement of very different things, is in unison; and that which, in song, is called by the musicians '*harmony*,' is, in a city, '*concord*.'"

† "For government, though high, and low, and lower,  
Put into parts, doth keep in one consent,  
Congreering in a full and natural close,  
Like music."

posed to be living and intelligent,) conspire, without any thing of the spirit of rivalry or counterblast, to heighten the effect of each other:—how the *discords* which may sometimes grate upon the ear may arise from some of the strings or pipes going "out of tune," or from their leaving their own part for the purpose of attempting to take a part which belongs to another, or from officious and unskilful, and, it may be, even mischievous, intermeddling, from some quarter or other, with the tension of the strings, or the adjustment of the pipes, or the arrangement of the parts to be played. And he might also have referred to certain pieces of Church-music, composed by St. Paul and others; such as Rom. xii. 2-16, and 1 Cor. i. 10-13, &c. The illustration he has chosen as his guiding-star is altogether inapt and unintelligible as applied to his subject. We can understand what is meant by *harmonious* action; but a "*working equilibrium*" is what Dr. Whately calls "a *mathematical impossibility*, which involves an absurdity and self-contradiction." This incongruity is very candidly admitted by Mr. Steward himself, in the very first sentence of his chapter on the "Balance:"—

"By this," he says, "is not meant what the word 'balance,' if literally taken, would seem to intimate,—a perfect parity between two constituent forces in a community, which, as placed in opposition to each other, serve but to negative the action of each respectively. Such a balance must imply, not perpetual motion, but perpetual standstill; a notion which, as applied to minds," (and to matter, too,) "is a simple impossibility. All balanced counteraction in societies implies dissolution, or that one or other of their constituents ultimately prevails. By 'balance,' then, is not meant parity in reference to government, or there could be no rule; but such a combination of forces, of different kinds, as serves to modify the ascendant one."—P. 20.

This is intelligible, though not very happily or coherently expressed. But then, for consistency's sake, and for the sake of perspicuity, from this point through the rest of the volume, the terms "*balance*" and "*balance-principle*," and "*equilibrium*," with respect to Church-government, should have been dropped altogether, and the term "combination of different forces," or some equivalent expression, should have been used in their stead. Otherwise, by using, as he does, old words with *new* meanings, which few of his readers will be likely to remember, and the introduction of which very greatly lacks the "*callida junctura*" upon which Horace insists, as being essential to the acceptance and currency of such innovations, he "darkens" his "counsel," almost as much as if he had employed "words *without* meaning." In plain English, his object is to indicate a course of procedure between Absolutism (on the part of Ministers) on the one hand, and Democracy on the other; and this intermediate course he calls "Moderatism." In the remarks which he has

made on these three principles, we freely admit, there is much to approve and admire; and we repudiate the extremes which he condemns, as heartily as he could wish us to do. In so saying, we express also our approval of a system which shall be neither the one nor the other, though we reject the absurdity of its being a "combination" or even "apposition" of two principles which are incompatible with, and contradictory to, each other. We also accept, as freely as he does, the teaching of St. Paul and St. Peter, that government in the Church—but not the *whole* government—is both the ordinance of God, and of man likewise; and that, in those cases of mere detail in which God has not spoken, man may ordain, provided only and always, that his ordinances so agree with the *principles divinely authorized*, as not to detract from them on the one hand, nor to add to them on the other. But at this point we must needs leave him. In sketching his theory of Church-government, he has wandered away from the economy of Christ's household and kingdom to those of merely human societies and worldly governments; and in so doing he has introduced *new principles*, not merely supplementary,—which would be bad enough,—but even contrary, as we think, to "the law of Christ." His theory, therefore, "is of the earth, earthy, and speaketh of the earth;" and it "savoureth not the things that be of God, but those that be of men;" and therefore, as a whole, is utterly inadmissible. "With these views"—to use his own words—"we cannot hold the foundation as sure; and, if there be fault in the foundation, we may be surely spared the labour of examining the superstructure,"\* beyond what we have already done in our remarks upon his scriptural precedents. "No more need be said," except that almost every thing that is valuable in his *theory*, is already to be found in *practice*, in the ecclesiastical system which, nevertheless, he so unsparingly condemns.

We deeply regret the necessity of advertng to such topics. A truce, we say, to all controversies on mere externals, saving the right of defence to those whom their adversaries will not suffer to be quiet. The Apostles and earlier Churches had little or no controversy upon such matters; and it was only when attention was transferred from the spirit to the letter, from the substance to the form, that those Churches began to decline in their power for *good*, as well as in their purity. Nor did the Protestant Reformers, in the first instance, object to the external form and polity of the Church against which they protested, but against its doctrinal errors, its blinding superstitions, and its blasphemous idolatry. But as the new or Reformed Churches began to quarrel about modes of worship, and other matters of

\* Appendix II., containing "Remarks on an Essay on the Constitution of Wesleyan Methodism, by John Beecham;" an Essay which we strongly recommend to the attention of our readers.

still less importance, the *true* spirit of the Reformation began to wax feeble, the fires of their sanctuaries were buried in ashes; and a renewed dispensation of the Spirit of power and grace became necessary, to renew their strength and to re-kindle their glory. So it will always be. The zeal expended upon things merely external, is so much withdrawn from what is due to those things which are spiritual; and the jewel is forgotten, and in danger of being lost altogether, in the bustle of those who *will* tinker the casket. The guilt of these damaging controversies rests, of course, with the *aggressors*, and with those who encourage them, whosoever they be; just as the guilt of the mischief that may accompany, or follow, the European war now opening its thunders, rests with the Russian Czar, and with those who may abet him. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," as to what Church or Society it is that most nearly approaches the scriptural standard, and will best subserve, in his own case, the great objects which all Churches ought to promote; and then let him study to "be quiet and do his own business," and "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Should he want other work, there is better work to be done, if the Apostle was right, than that of "meddling with those who are given to change." Our own country demands of the Churches a more thorough cultivation, and "the field" of "the world" is all before them. Let their "wars cease." Let them "beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks," and let them "learn war no more." "Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless us. God shall bless us; and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him."

---

ART. VII.—1. *State Papers published under the Authority of Her Majesty's Commission.—King Henry the Eighth.* Eleven Vols. 4to. London. 1830–1852.

2. *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain, from the Commencement of the Twelfth Century to the Close of the Reign of Queen Mary.* Edited chiefly from the Originals in the State-Paper Office, the Tower of London, &c. By MARY ANNE EVERETT WOOD. Three Vols. London: Colburn. 1846.

3. *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, on the Lord's Supper.* Edited for the Parker Society by THE REV. JOHN EDMUND COPE, M.A. Two Vols. 8vo. Cambridge. 1844.

4. *Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, sometime Bishop of Worcester.* Edited for the Parker Society by THE REV. GEORGE ELWES CORRIE, B.D. 8vo. Cambridge. 1845.

5. *Remains of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter.* Edited for the Parker Society by THE REV. GEORGE PEARSON, D.D. 8vo. Cambridge. 1846.

THE transition periods of history present to the mental vision of the philosophic thinker phases fraught with deep interest, not only from their ultimate bearing upon the wide out-stretching destinies of countries and kingdoms, some of them slumbering in the mysterious haze of a yet undreamed-of future, but also from their developments of human power and human passion, alternately swaying, and swayed by, the strong current of events. Great men and great events have, from the world's beginning, sprung up simultaneously. Whether the men create the events, or the events bring out the else latent powers of the men, is a question ever mooted, but never to be decided, unless we can come to the conclusion that He who controls *both* fits his instruments for the work which He has in store for them to do, and the work for the men whom He has thus supremely gifted.

But what is to be understood by a transitional period of history? Not that which bears the impress of external force, when the iron rod of conquest, stretched over a desolated country, strikes down half its inhabitants, and makes slaves of the rest. The reckless conquerors subdue, but they do not convince; and the crushed victims submit, but are not changed. No one of the many conquests to which England, in its earlier history, was subjected, can be called a transitional period, excepting that of the Roman; when, not by the power of the sword, but by the introduction of wise and beneficent laws, of civilized usages, and of the benignant influences of Christianity, a complete, though not a rapid, change was produced in the whole character of the population; and this, not after the manner of the fierce Saxon, the piratical Dane, and the hardy Norse-man of after times,—by so large an indraught of the conquering nation, as made the natives only a small proportion of the whole population,—but by the strong influence exercised over those natives themselves. Far more important than the changes produced by the rush of conquest, are those that spring up silently from a nation's heart, as the progress of resistless truth makes for itself a deepening course, and bursts down, one after another, the barriers which the prejudices of ages have heaped in its way, but which were never before felt as barriers; for the strong stream had not reached their limits. Now they are slowly undermined, or bravely—it may be, fiercely—overleaped; and broad and gushing lies the out-spread stream, widened as well as deepened, and laughs at the feeble strength which would have held in its course.

Who is not conscious of the thrillingness of the transitional periods of his own life, or of the young lives, perhaps still dearer, growing up around him? With what earnest hope we watch



the early gleams of intellect in the child that, fitfully and by starts, wanders out of his own little fairy realm into the *real* world, and surprises us with his eager questionings of that which *is*! The child is becoming a boy; years roll on; his converse is with the *real*; and he has so much to do in "guessing his wondering way" amidst the marvels which surround him, that he has no time left for any thing else, till another transitional period arrives. The *spiritualities* of life, the mysteries that lie beneath the surface of things, are dimly recognised, and tremblingly pored into; and we feel that the mind has awoken to a fully-developed consciousness, and that there is now no limit, beyond that of its own strength, to which, if uncontrolled by circumstances, it may not aspire.

Somewhat analogous to these two periods are the changes in a nation's history. During the time of the Romans, our forefathers emerged from infancy to boyhood; but their progress was so frequently interrupted by foreign wars, and civil strife, that ages intervened before any material advance was made. In the fifteenth century, however, the invention of printing gave an electric impulse to the intellect of Europe; and in 1509, when our Eighth Henry ascended the throne, there were latent energies rousing into action, which, independently of himself, must have rendered his reign a heart-stirring time. We are too much in the habit of regarding England as exclusively Popish at the accession of Henry VIII., and as exclusively Protestant when the sceptre was swayed by Queen Elizabeth; and of attributing the change mainly to the personal influence of these strong-willed Tudor Sovereigns. But neither one position nor the other is strictly correct. In both cases, there were counter elements at work; and it was the power possessed by these Princes, of throwing the potent *prestige* of Government into the scale of the party which they favoured, that enabled them to wield the sceptre with a despotism exercised by no Sovereign of England before or since.

The pulses beating at a nation's heart are but imperfectly registered by the cursory surveyor of its acts. Our chroniclers tell us little of the workings of those movements, of which they record only the results; but a succession of coincidences, fortunate for us, though most unfortunate for the parties themselves, has laid open before us a series of private records of the reign of Henry VIII., unequalled in extent and value by those of any nation in Europe, at so early a period. The disgrace and fall of his two successive Prime Ministers, Wolsey and Cromwell, occasioned the seizure of their papers, and the preservation of a long series of documents, which can scarcely be too highly prized. We have not only their State correspondence, but letters addressed to them by persons in every stage of society, and on every class of subjects; whilst, to complete the picture of society thus formed, and

to fill in its domestic details, we have a third set of papers,—those of Arthur Plantagenet, Viscount Lisle, a natural son of Edward IV., and Governor of Calais. He was a man of large family connexions; and his private correspondence is curiously illustrative of home life in the sixteenth century. His papers were seized, and he himself was committed to the Tower on a charge of official negligence, which was construed into treason. He was ultimately exonerated, but died in the Tower, of the very joy of release. From these three classes of documents are mainly gathered the contents of the volumes, some of them large and ponderous, the titles of which are placed at the head of this paper; and from them we shall obtain a view, as clear as our limits will permit, of the state of religious belief, of social and domestic life; and may also indulge in a peep at bluff King Hal himself, not in his robe and crown, but in his doublet and jerkin, when he unkinged himself in his cheery, and often very homely, unbendings with his courtiers. Somewhat, too, of the hidden workings of his strong and fiery passions, of the sinuous and treacherous policy of Wolsey, and of the avaricious and servile temper of Cromwell, will come before our view. But of this more anon.

The Court in which More and Russell flourished, in which Holbein painted, and Surrey sang, was awaking to the importance of extending the education of youth beyond the mere reading and writing, the hunting and hawking, which had hitherto formed its principal sphere. The collections of State Papers before us, however, being published chiefly for historical purposes, give us little information on this head; and we supply the lack from some private memoranda of our own. The following letter is from the Schoolmaster of the Duke of Richmond, the natural son of Henry VIII., to Wolsey. This boy, then about eight years of age, was established with a princely Court at Pomfret Castle, to fill, under the direction of a Council, the post of Lord Warden of the Border Marches.

"Most humbly beseeching Your Grace, your Orator and Daily Beadman, Richard Croke, Schoolmaster to the Duke of Richmond, that it would please Your Grace, of your most abundant goodness, to direct your most gracious letters of commandment unto my Lord of Richmond's Council, comprising these articles following:—

"First, the quantity of time which I shall daily occupy with my Lord in learning, by Your Grace appointed; the said Council permit and suffer me to have access unto him one hour before Mass and breakfast, according to Your Grace's former commandment. The rest of the time of instruction of my said Lord to be taken at my discretion, and as I shall perceive most convenient, and my said Lord most apt to learn, provided that no more time by me be occupied in one day, than by Your Grace shall be appointed, nor that I so remit any part of the same, that thereby my Lord's learning may decay.

"Second, that whereas my said Lord is forced to write of his own

hand to Abbots and mean persons, contrary to Your Grace's commandment, and *that* immediately after his dinner and repast taken, to the great dulling of his wits, spirits, and memory, and no little hurt of his head, stomach, and body. And that it were very necessary, in my poor judgment, my said Lord should write nothing of his own hand, but in Latin, specially to the King's Highness and Your most noble Grace, to the intent that he might more firmly imprint in his mind both words and phrases of the Latin tongue, and the sooner frame him to some good style in writing, whereunto he is now very ripe: it would please Your Grace therefore to determine and appoint both certain persons and also certain times in the week, to whom only, and when, my said Lord shall write, either in English or in the Latin tongue, as your high wisdom shall think most convenient, provided the said exercise of his hand and style, in both the tongues, be committed only to the discretion and order of me, his Schoolmaster, and that no man may force him to write, unless I be there present to direct and form his said hand and style.

"Thirdly, that whereas by example of good education, as well in *nourriture* as good learning, of such young gentlemen as by Your Grace's commandment be attendant upon my said Lord, the same might more facilely be induced to profit in his learning, it would please Your Grace to give commandment that the instruction of the said gentlemen be at the only order and disposition of the Schoolmaster. So that they be straitly commanded to apply their learning at such times as I shall think convenient, without maintenance of any man to the contrary; and also that none of them, nor any other, be suffered to continue in my Lord's chamber, during the time of his learning, but such only as the said Schoolmaster shall think meet, for the furtherance of the same.

"Fourthly, it would please Your Grace in like wise to command that the time of my Lord's learning, by Your Grace appointed, be not interrupted for any trifle, or resort of any stranger, but only strangers of honour, to whom also, if my said Lord might, by the advice of his Schoolmaster, exhibit and make some show of his learning, like as he was wont and doth of his other pastimes, it should greatly encourage him to his learning; to the which, because it is most laborious and tedious to children, His Grace should be most specially animated and encouraged.

"Finally, that no ways, colour, nor craft be taken, to discourage alienate, or avert my said Lord's mind from learning, or to extinguish the love of learning in his estimation, but that he be induced most highly to esteem his book of all his other studies. The which thing, with other the premises, obtained, I dare be bold to assure Your Grace, that his learning, at the sight of Your Grace, shall, with no little time, and much pleasure of himself, far surmount and pass the knowledge of any child of his years, time, and age, none excepted."—*Wolsey Correspondence*, vol. iii., p. 93, *State-Paper Office*.

Amidst the immense mass of Cromwell's Correspondence, there are many interesting notices of the early education and habits of his young son Gregory. Some of these are curious, as affording illustrations of the modes of study, &c., adopted at that period. Gregory was placed under the care of Dr. Row-

land Lee, afterwards Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, who frequently wrote to Cromwell, announcing the improvement of his "little man" in learning, and also his proficiency in the exercises of the chase, to which he was greatly addicted. After the elevation of Dr. Lee to his bishopric, the charge of young Cromwell devolved more immediately upon Henry Dawes, the Bishop's Chaplain, from whom we have the two following letters:—

"Pleaseth it your mastership to be advertised, that Mr. Gregory, with all his company here, are (thanks be to God) in health, daily occupied and embusied in the train and exercise of learning, under such manner and form as there is no small hope the success thereof to be such as shall content and satisfy your good trust and expectation. Being much more likelihood of profit and increase, than at any time heretofore; partly for cause he is now brought somewhat in an awe and dread, ready to give himself unto study when he shall be thereunto required, and partly since things which heretofore have alienated and detracted his mind from labours to be taken for the attainment of good letters, are now subdued and withdrawn. Whereunto (as a thing not of least moment and regard) may be added the ripeness and maturity of his wit; which, not being of that hasty sort that bye and bye do bring forth their fruit, doth daily grow to a more docility and apt readiness to receive that that shall be showed him by his teachers. The order of his study, as the hours limited for the French tongue, writing, playing at weapons, casting of accounts, pastimes of instruments, and such others, hath been devised and directed by the prudent wisdom of Mr. Southwell, who, with a fatherly zeal and amity, much desiring to have him a son worthy such parents, ceaseth not as well concerning all other things for him meet and necessary, as also in learning, to express his tender love and affection towards him, searching, by all means possible, how he may most profit,—daily hearing him to read somewhat in the English tongue, and advertising him of the natural and true kind of pronounciation thereof, expounding also and declaring the etymology and native signification of such words as we have borrowed of the Latins or Frenchmen, not even so commonly used in our quotidian speech. Mr. Cheney and Mr. Charles in like wise endeavoureth and employeth themselves, accompanying Mr. Gregory in learning, among whom is a perpetual contention, strife, and conflict, and in manner of an honest envy who shall do best, not only in the French tongue, (wherein Mr. Vallence, after a wondrously compendious, facile, prompt, and ready way, not without painful diligence and laborious industry, doth instruct them,) but also in writing, playing at weapons, and all other their exercises. So that, if continuance in this behalf may take place, whereas the last summer was spent in the service of the wild goddess Diana, this shall, I trust, be consecrated to Apollo and the Muses, to their no small profit and your good contentation and pleasure. And thus, I beseech our Lord to have you in his most gracious tuition. At Rising in Norfolk, this last day of April.

"Your faithful and most

"Bounden Servant,

"HENRY DAWES."

—*Miscellaneous Letters, Second Series*, vol. ix., p. 39, *State-Paper Office*.

A little later occurs the following:—

"After he hath heard Mass, he taketh a lecture of Erasmus's '*Colloquium*' called '*Pietas Puerilis*,' wherein is described a very picture of one that should be virtuously brought up; and because it is so necessary for him, I do not only cause him to read it over, but also to practise the precepts of the same; and I have also translated it into English, so that he may confer them both together, whereof, as learned men affirm, cometh no small profit; which translation, pleaseth it you to receive by the bringer hereof, that you may judge how much profitable it is to be learned. After that, he exerciseth his hand in writing one or two hours, and readeth upon Fabian's Chronicle as long: the residue of the day he doth spend upon the lute and virginals. When he rideth, (as he doth very oft,) I tell him, by the way, some history of the romances or the Greeks, which I cause him to rehearse again in a tale. For his recreation, he useth to hawk and hunt, and shoot in his long bow, which frameth and succeedeth so well with him, that he seemeth to be thereunto given by nature."—*Miscellaneous Letters, Second Series*, vol. ix., p. 40, *State-Paper Office*.

This scale of education, limited and uncomprehensive as it was, far exceeded the usual modicum. Public schools for the instruction of youth of the higher orders were of recent institution. In reference to one of these, we hear of objections made to the placing of *four* boys in one bed, but met in a mode evidently deemed most satisfactory by the master; namely, by a statement, that the bed is *large* enough for four *men*, and that the companions of "Master James" are all "*clean-skinned children*:" whilst, in a young ladies' boarding-school, one of the pupils loses a pair of shoes in a bet with a lady's-maid; and another displays far more eagerness about her coifs, and partlets, and satin gowns, than about her lessons, which were confined to reading, writing, learning to play upon the spinnet and regals, and the endless stitcheries in wools, worsteds, and silks, rivalled in the German-wool mania of our days. Domestic education was rarely made of sufficient importance to require a separate official as instructor. The family Chaplain, where such existed, added the "teaching the young idea how to shoot," to sundry other duties, sometimes miscellaneous enough, which fell to his department; and a lady's-maid was considered of additional value, if she could not only care for her lady's robes, but also teach good manners to her lady's daughters.

"'Madam,' writes a noble lady, who is urgently recommending the virtues and excellencies of 'a good maid, both *sad* (steady) and wise, and true of heart and tongue;' 'Madam, this gentlewoman can do any manner of service you put her to, either to wait upon your Ladyship, or to wait on my Lord's daughters and yours, and to bring them up well, and can teach them *right good manners*; or to keep your plate, or your napery, she can do very well, or any other service.'"—*Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies*, vol. ii., p. 81.

Parents not unfrequently sent their children to some neighbour-



ing convent, where, if they learned little, they were at least out of the way, at an expense as trifling as that of certain advertising schools of the present day, in which the juvenile inmates are completely "done for," that is, boarded, clothed, and educated, for £16 a year, and no vacations! The consequence was, that few, even among the higher classes, were sufficiently expert in the use of the pen, to dispense with a secretary; they always signed, but seldom wrote, their own letters; and occasionally, when they did so, their offences against orthography, unsettled and varying though it was, were so flagrant as to render it matter of regret that they did not adopt the *façon d'agir* of a certain Russian Prince, who wrote with his own hand, to show all due courtesy to his correspondent; but, for the sake of convenience, sent a copy written by his secretary. What, for instance, can be more atrocious than the following lines, penned in a hand which, to judge from the specimen given in a facsimile, is as bad as the spelling; yet the production of a lady who was the daughter of one of the first Peers in the realm, and who, in her married life, filled the place left vacant by the death of a daughter of Edward IV., in becoming the second wife of the Duke of Norfolk?—

"I pra you to lat me haff knowyng wwhether you haff rassaived my boke hoff hartacles, and my later that I sand you wythal, to intrat my Lord my hasban to haff a bater leffeng. I pra you sand me word in wryeteng wat hanware you had. I pra to God that I may be my fforten to do you sum plaser ffor the kynness that hy haff ffon in you; he sal haff my hart and my god wyl hy leff, and hal the ffrendes thahat I kan make."

Lest our readers should not easily read this riddle, we subjoin its solution:—

"I pray you to let me have knowing whether you have received my book of articles, and my letter that I sent you withal, to entreat my Lord my husband to have a better living. I pray you send me word in writing what answer you had. I pray to God that it may be my fortune to do you some pleasure for the kindness that I have found in you: ye shall have my heart and my good will (while) I live, and all the friends that I can make."—*Letters, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 221.

There were accomplishments, however, in which the fair fingers, innocent of ink, excelled, and in which we find amusing traces of assistance received from the other sex. A notable housewife, whose decoctions and confections were in a style sufficiently *recherché* to be thought worthy of presenting to the royal table, writes to no less a person than a future Bishop, in reference to some instructions in cookery, which she had received from him:—

"Sir,—These shall be to desire you to be so good unto your servant and worst scholar, as to write unto me of the thing that you taught

me, how many pounds of sugar must go to how many pounds of quinces, barberries, and damascenes, or plums. I have clean forgotten how many pounds of the one and of the other. Now the time of quinces is come, I would fain be doing. It may please you, therefore, to write to me of all this, and of any thing more that it will please you to teach me."—*Letters, &c.*, vol. iii., p. 30.

We find another member of the clerical profession, who, being left steward in the house of his absent patroness, was expected to keep strict count of all the beds and pillows, bolsters, cushions, and coverlets, and to air them occasionally: he was severely blamed for not attending to this part of his duty, as well as for neglect in more important matters, and a substitute was sought for. A correspondent writes to the lady patroness:—

"Your chapel standeth unserved, saving the Vicar causeth one Mass in the week there to be said, which is of his devotion. But there is an honest Priest hath guaranteed to serve there for forty shillings by the year, because he will be quiet to serve God; and he will mend your bedding, and other such stuff as is need, if it shall so please you for to take him; a middle-aged man. I have stayed him unto the time I must know your mind in it."—*Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 142.

The King bestowed one of his most lucrative benefices on a Priest that trained his hawks, when in one year he had trained two "which fly and kill their game very well, to His Highness's singular pleasure and contentation."

There are few more truthful standards of the hold which religion possesses over the mass of a people, than the estimate in which they rank its Ministers; and, at this period, many circumstances combined to bring down that estimate below its healthful level. The secular functions of the Clergy were too multifarious for reverential exclusiveness. They were the lawyers, the secretaries, the scribes, often the stewards, of the higher classes; and although literature was beginning to flourish, as a hardy native plant, outside the sheltering walls of a monastery, yet by far the larger proportion of its votaries were of the ecclesiastical profession. The growing necessities of society required more extensive services from these semi-professionals. Thus they were brought, in the contact of daily life, into more frequent connexion with the laity; and the proverb, that "familiarity breeds contempt," was too frequently realized, and realized the more readily, because the super-human position challenged for themselves by the Romish hierarchy was found to be coincident with the passions, and often, alas! with the frailties, of our erring humanity. As the statue stepped from its pedestal, its veil flew aside, and revealed, not the features of calm, immortal, benignant beauty, but of strong humanity, fraught with the intensity of the same life which was kindling the myriad bosoms around it into every form of energy, working for good or ill,

according to the leading of its impulses; and the Priest stood forth as a man of like passions with his fellow-men. "*Heu, quantū de spe cecidi!*" was the involuntary exclamation of many a heart, from which the instinct of veneration, the "hero-worship" of the sixteenth century, was thus painfully rooted up. The monasteries, also, became objects of suspicion. Of their value in humanizing and civilizing,—of their importance in a social, as well as a literary, point of view, as a refuge for the poor and the wanderer, and an asylum for the thoughtful heart that shrunk from wrestling with the wild spirit of the age, during the long periods of civil commotion which characterized our Plantagenet dynasty,—of these there cannot be a doubt, even in the mind of the firmest Protestant. But a long period of repose had been enjoyed, in which their incomes had largely increased; and, uncontrolled by the force of external opinion, vices were spreading amongst the monastic orders to a frightful extent,—an extent which was in itself an earnest of their dissolution.

More potent, also, than either of the above-mentioned elements of change, was the slow, but silent, spread of the word of God, which, directly or indirectly, led to a gradual awakening of the spirit of religious inquiry,—a spirit ever fatal to a system which has built, on the pure and holy foundation of Gospel truth, a superstructure so blended with the "hay and stubble" of human invention, as is Roman Catholicism. Surprise became indignation, when it was slowly discovered, that the very doctrines which had added most to priestly power and priestly wealth,—*e.g.*, those of Transubstantiation, Confession, Purgatory, Indulgences, &c.,—were not to be found at all in God's own word.

With such thoughts brooding in the minds of the few, what instrument seemed more likely to uphold and strengthen the existing state of things, and effectually to control opposition, than the elevation, to the highest offices and influence in the State, of a subtle, enterprising, and ambitious Priest? Such a man was Cardinal Wolsey. Yet, next to the King himself, he was, indirectly, unconsciously, and most reluctantly, the principal agent in bringing about the change of opinions. Sprung from the lower ranks of society, and owing his elevation solely to the favour of his royal master, Wolsey, with the upstart Duke of Suffolk, Charles Brandon, headed a party at Court, which had to struggle for existence with the hereditary nobility and ancient clerocracy. In the eagerness of the struggle, neither showed any hyper-fastidiousness, as to the means by which he might humble his political opponents; and Wolsey, in many instances, particularly in his lenient dealings with Latimer, allowed indulgence to the new principles, or, at least, refrained from insisting on their suppression as strongly as his ecclesiastical position would seem to have demanded, until he was too firmly seated in his throne of imaginary security to fear a rival. Our readers need

hardly be reminded, that one of the proudest titles now worn by the Sovereign of Great Britain, "Defender of the Faith," was first bestowed on our Eighth Harry, as a compliment for his "book against Luther," which was received at Rome with high honours and laudations.

The sternness with which the King looked upon the new doctrines is abundantly manifested in the following letter from one of the diplomatists of his Court, then at Brussels, to another, their sentiments being, of course, founded upon those of their master:—

"The 22nd day of this month, there is a publication done in the Emperor's name, through all this country of Brabant, that all the New Testaments translated in French, Dutch, or English, shall be brought to the Justices' hands to be burned, within the 25th day of November next coming, upon great pains, every man for him; and that from henceforward, is commanded no more such heretic books to be written, copied, or imprinted, nor read, neither kept public, neither secretly, upon like pains; and if there be any man that sustains heresy, he shall be justified (executed) with the sword; and if any woman be faulty, to be *quick* buried, (buried alive,) cast and couched in a pit under the earth; and that if there be any man found that has been aforetime accused and pardoned, that turns again to his errors, he shall be burned without any further delay; with many other good articles contained in the said publication, right convenient for the exaltation and increase of the holy Catholic faith, and for the extirpation and annihilation of the false heretics' intentions and opinions."—*State Papers*, vol. xii., p. 210.

Presently, however, symptoms of change of opinion began to appear. Gardiner, writing to Wolsey about the same date, says:—

"The King's Highness willed me, also, to write unto Your Grace, that being suit made unto him in favour of the Prior of Reading, who for Luther's opinion is now in prison, and hath been a good season, at Your Grace's commandment, that unless the matter be much notable and very heinous, he desireth Your Grace, at his request, to cause the said Prior to be restored to liberty, and discharged of that imprisonment."—*Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 346.

During the few ensuing years, it was no easy matter for even the most pliable of courtly consciences exactly to ascertain and accommodate themselves to *what* it was expedient for them to believe. A correspondent writes:—

"The news here are these. Many Preachers we have, but they come not from one master; for, as it is reported, their messages be diverse. Latimer many blameth, and as many doth allow. I heard him preach on Friday last, and, as methought, very good and well."—*Lisle Papers*, vol. xiv.

The awkward dilemmas to which the Prelates and others were reduced, between their wish to stand well with the King, and to maintain clerical consistency, are amusingly exposed in the following letter from Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester, to Cromwell:—

“Right Honourable and my singular good Lord,—

“These be to put your Lordship in remembrance of my suit unto you for an order to be taken for sermons at the Cross; \* for, since the Parliament, I could not get one to preach a sermon there, saving myself, or one of my Chaplains; except one day only that Dr. Bird, at long suit, preached one sermon. I promised to write a book to your Lordship for the said sermons, the which I have sent here, with the bill; and if it please your Lordship to subscribe it, and command it to the Bishop of London; for he can make provision for Preachers better than any else, (as his Chaplains reporteth,) and as I, indeed, think; for many doth refrain to preach there, because that he hath not the order thereof; and of the other side, when I or any of mine preach there, we are so untruly reported, that we dare not without fear to preach any more there; for whereas a Chaplain of mine preached on Sunday last at the Cross, now he is cited to appear before the Bishop of London, on Friday next: but I trust he hath nothing preached against God’s laws, nor the King’s; and on Sunday next, for lack of one to preach, I must preach there myself, with more fear than ever I did in my life.”

The following letter from Latimer, then Bishop of Worcester, to Cromwell, relates to the preparation of the work usually known as “the Bishops’ book,”—“The godly and pious Institution of a Christian Man,”—the scope of which was to give form and consistency to the then Creed of the Court. It was left to the King’s option, either to have it brought out under his own name, or that of its true compilers, Latimer and Fox, the Bishops of Worcester and Hereford; and he chose the latter. How seriously they regarded the task, they shall themselves inform us:—

“This day,” writes Latimer, “we had finished (I trow) the rest of our book, if my Lord of Hereford had not been diseased; to whom surely we owe great thanks for his great diligence in all our proceedings. Upon Monday (I think) it will be done altogether, and then my Lord of Canterbury will send it unto your Lordship with all speed; to whom also, if any thing be praiseworthy, a good part of the praise rightly belongs. As for myself, I can nothing else but pray God, that, when it is done, it be well and sufficiently done, so that we shall not need to have any more such doings; for, verily, for my part, I had liever be poor Parson of poor Kinton again, than to continue thus Bishop of Worcester; not for any thing that I have had to do therein, or can do; but yet, forsooth, it is a troublous thing to agree upon a doctrine, in things of such controversy, with judgments of such diversity, every man (I trust) meaning well, and yet not all meaning one way. But I doubt not but now, in the end, we shall agree both one with another, and all with the truth, though some will then marvel. And yet, if there be any thing either uncertain or untrue, I have good hope that the King’s Highness will *expurge* whatever is of the old leaven; at leastway, give it some note that it may appear he perceiveth it, though he do tolerate it for a time; so giving place, for

---

\* St. Paul’s Cross.



a season, to the frailty and gross capacity of his subjects."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 563.

Fox, writing on the same subject to Cromwell, informs him that—

"Notwithstanding all the diligence we could possibly use in the printing of our book, the same cannot be finished before Tuesday next. It groweth somewhat unto a greater quantity than I showed your Lordship of at the beginning; and I assure you that I had little thought that the correcting and setting forth of the same should have stood me in so much pain and labour as it hath done. Notwithstanding, when it shall come forth, I trust it shall content the King's Highness."

This unsettled state of opinion brought to the block, within a few years of each other, martyrs alike for the Catholic and Reformed faith; but then both these terms must be understood in a modified sense. Papists of the temper of Gardiner and Bonner were willing to sign the renunciation of the Pope's supreme power, and to take the oath of supremacy to Henry VIII.; whilst a Protestant as true-hearted as Cranmer still held to the doctrine of transubstantiation; and the performance of Masses for the dead proved that the country had not eschewed the fable of purgatory. The following was written to Cromwell on the death of Queen Jane Seymour, by Sir Richard Gresham:—

"Mine humble duty remembered to your good Lordship, &c. It shall please you to understand, that by the commandment of the Duke of Norfolk, I have caused twelve hundred Masses to be said within the City of London, for the soul of our most gracious Queen. And whereas the Mayor, and Alderman, with the Commoners, was lately at Paul's, and there gave thanks unto God for the birth of our Prince, my Lord, I do think it were convenient, that there should be also at Paul's a solemn dirge and Mass; and that the Mayor, Alderman, with the Commoners, be there, for to pray and offer for Her Grace's soul. My Lord, it shall please you to move the King's Highness, and, his pleasure known in this behalf, I am and shall be ready to accomplish his most gracious pleasure. As knoweth God, who give unto you good health with long life."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 571.

Well indeed was it for the cause of humanity, that neither Wolsey nor Cranmer, the leading Churchmen of the times, was of violent or sanguinary temper; for the fierce and stormy passions of their master were easily roused to acts of brutality, and religious persecution was too sadly the vice of the age. The manner in which it was discountenanced by Cranmer, places his character in a very pleasing light:—

"My Lord,—In my most hearty wise I commend me unto your good Lordship. And whereas I am credibly informed, that at your commandment, one Sir Thomas Mounteford, Priest, is committed to the Fleet, for certain words (as is reported) by him spoken against me,

which now he utterly refuseth, and thereto offereth himself to prove the contrary in that behalf, by divers that were there present, when the said words should have been spoken of me: I most heartily desire your Lordship, at this mine instance and request, ye will discharge him, for [the] time, of this his trouble and vexation; for surely, of all sorts of men, I am dally informed that Priests report the worse of me; and therefore so to be reported of a Priest, it should very little grieve me, although he had confessed it; much less now would I then this his trouble for the same, he himself reporting the contrary. Wherefore eftsoons I require you to be good Lord unto him herein, and that the rather at this mine instance."—*Cranmer's Works*, vol. ii., p. 291.

"Right Worshipful,—In my most hearty wise I commend me unto you. And whereas I understand that amongst other persons attainted of high treason, the Prior of Axholm, named Webster, and Master Raynold of Syon be judged according to the law, for offending against the late Act of Parliament made for the suppressing of the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome; surely I do much marvel of them both, specially of Mr. Raynold, having such sight in Scriptures and Doctors, and also of the other, which promised me that he would never meddle for the defence of that opinion; much pitying me that such men should suffer with so ignorant judgments; and if there be none other offence laid against them than this one, it will be much more for the conversion of all the favourers hereof, after mine opinion, that their consciences may be clearly averted from the same by communication of sincere doctrine, and so they to publish it likewise to the world, than by the justice of the law to suffer in such ignorance. And if it would please the King's Highness to send them unto me, I suppose I could do very much with them in this behalf."—*Cranmer's Works*, vol. ii., p. 303.

Cranmer dared to go farther than any mortal man in opposition to the will of the Tudor lion; yet he could not prevent the execution, within two years of each other, of the venerable Sir Thomas More, of Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and the poor deluded "Holy Maid of Kent, Elizabeth Barton," and others, whose names swell the lists of Popish martyrologies, nor of the venerable Tyndale, to whom we owe the earliest printed translation of the Bible. Thus, at the very same period, persecutions more or less virulent were carried on, by those who had ceded a few important points, against the stricter Romanists, who had not taken as many steps as themselves, and against the open favourers of the Lutheran heresy.

Another character, far less intrinsically estimable than that of Cranmer, had still an important influence in favouring the spread of the new doctrines. This was Thomas Cromwell; first Secretary, then Privy Seal, and, at length, Earl of Essex. As to his private character, the revelations in his printed Correspondence, and, still more forcibly, in other portions of it which have not yet seen the light, prove but too incontrovertibly that he was venial to a degree far beyond his contemporaries even in a corrupt age; and his good-will was pretty generally understood to be a mar-

ketable commodity. Yet, when important interests were pending, he threw aside meaner motives, and spoke and acted with a firmness and vigour, which do credit alike to his understanding and his heart. We find him patronizing the earliest literary efforts of Myles Coverdale,—Tyndale's assistant in Bible translations. The following is from an early epistle, signed, "Friar Myles Coverdale," to Cromwell, then Secretary of State:—

"Most singular good Master,—With due humility, I beseech unto your Mastership all godly comfort, grace, and prosperous health. For so much as your goodness is so great toward me, your poor child, only through the plenteousness of your favour and benevolence, I am the bolder of your goodness, in this my rude style, if it like your favour, to revocate to your memory the godly communication which your Mastership had with me, your orator, in Master More's house, upon Easter-Eve, amongst many and divers fruitful exhortations, specially of your singular favour; and by your most comfortable words, I perceive your gracious mind toward me. Wherefore, most honourable Master, for the tender love of God, and for the fervent zeal that you have to virtue and godly study, falling on the knees of my heart, I humbly desire and beseech your goodness of your gracious help. Now I begin to taste of holy Scriptures; now (honour be to God!) I am set to the most sweet smell of holy letters, with the godly savour of holy and ancient Doctors, unto whose knowledge I cannot attain without diversity of books, as is not unknown to your most excellent wisdom. Nothing in the world I desire but books, as concerning my learning; they once had, I do not doubt but Almighty God shall perform that in me, which he of his most plentiful favour and grace hath begun. Moreover, as touching my behaviour, (your Mastership's mind once known,) with all lowliness I offer myself, not only to be ordered in all things as shall please your wisdom, but also as concerning the education and instruction of other, all only to ensue your prudent counsel."—*Works of Coverdale*, p. 490.

Who does not long for a daguerreotype of the Easter-Eve scene in "Master More's house," in which the venerable Chancellor—with "Mistress Margaret" standing at his side, and his wife and other children grouped around him—took part in the "divers fruitful exhortations" and "comfortable words" with which the astute Secretary of State encouraged the budding genius of the future translator, who, more fortunate than his companions, was the only one of the trio that escaped a violent death?

The edition of the Bible issued by Grafton and Coverdale, under Cromwell's auspices, was the subject of much correspondence; one or two specimens of which we subjoin:—

"After most humble and hearty commendations to your good Lordship,—Pleaseth the same to understand, that we be entered into your work of the Bible, whereof (according to our most bounden duty) we have here sent unto your Lordship two ensamples; one in parchment, wherein we intend to print one for the King's Grace, and another for

your Lordship; and the second in paper, whereof all the rest shall be made; trusting that it shall be not only to the glory of God, but a singular pleasure, also, to your good Lordship, the causer thereof, and a general edifying of the King's subjects, according to your Lordship's most godly request. For we follow not only a standing text of the Hebrew, with the interpretation of the Chaldee and the Greek, but we set, also, in a private table, the diversity of readings of all texts, with such annotations, in another table, as shall doubtless elucidate and clear the same; as well without any singularity of opinions, as all checkings and reproofs. The print, no doubt, shall please your good Lordship. The paper is of the best sort in France. The charge certainly is great; wherein, as we most humbly require your favourable help at this present with whatsoever it shall please your good Lordship to let us have; so trust we, (if need require,) in our just business, to be defended from the Papists by your Lordship's favourable letters, which we most humbly desire to have, (by this bearer, William Grey,) either to the Bishop of Winchester, or to some other whom your Lordship shall think most expedient. We be daily threatened, and look ever to be spoken withal, as this bearer can further inform your Lordship; but how they will use us, as yet we know not. Nevertheless, for our further assurance, wherethrough we may be the abler to perform this your Lordship's work, we are so much the bolder of your good Lordship; for other refuge have we none, under God and our King, whom, with noble Prince Edward, and all you, the most honourable Council, God Almighty preserve, now and ever. Amen. Written at Paris, the 23rd day of June, by your Lordship's assured and daily orators."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 678.

The result of these labours was, that, in 1541, the Privy Council were enabled to issue orders that the price of a Bible, unbound, should be ten shillings; and bound, twelve shillings, only.

Cromwell patronized other literary undertakings, besides the Scripture translation. The following is from a letter of Archbishop Cranmer to him:—

"This shall be to signify unto your Lordship, that I have overseen the Primer which you sent unto me, and therein I have noted and amended such faults as are most worthy of reformation. Divers things there are besides therein, which, if before the printing of the book had been committed unto me to oversee, I would have amended. Howbeit, they be not of that importance but that, for this time, they may be well enough permitted and suffered to be read of the people; and the book of itself, no doubt, is very good and commendable."—*Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 559.

One of the most important concomitant circumstances in strengthening the cause of the Reformation, was the suppression of the monasteries. Wolsey had here again opened the way for the wholesale changes that ensued, by requesting permission to suppress the smaller monasteries, which were notoriously vicious and profligate, and to draft off their inmates into larger and better-conducted houses; and then giving over their revenues into the hands of the King, who re-assigned them to Wolsey, to form

endowments for the Colleges he was instituting at Ipswich and Cambridge. This was giving the lion a taste of the prey; and he soon determined to be more than a mere vehicle of conveying the property. Having thrown off the yoke of Rome, he issued a commission for the general visitation of the monasteries, and suppressed and seized the revenues wherever the visitors found disorders; which, to eyes rendered vigilant by self-interest, were not difficult of detection.

Irregularities in the female monastic establishments were considered to arise chiefly from the gossiping tendencies of the inmates, their frequent and lengthened visitings beyond the enclosure of their monastery, and the habit of keeping as much company as they chose. Those houses, therefore, which were permitted to remain, received strict orders to enforce the rules of monastic enclosure,—a discipline against which they sorely revolted. The Nuns of Wilton broke out into open rebellion. Wolsey's agent declares that he has endeavoured, to the uttermost of his power, to persuade and train them to discipline, and has even put three or four of the ringleaders of the malcontents in ward; but that neither by gentle means nor vigorous could he obtain their consent to the enforcement of rule. He, therefore, took French leave, and acted without it, in closing up certain back-doors and bye-ways to the monastery, which had led to much private mischief, though he could not control access to the front door; but he charged the Lady Abbess to take the case seriously in hand. She informs Wolsey, that though she has often motioned her sisters to be reclused within the monastery, yet they do find many difficulties, and show divers considerations to the contrary; so that she begs a little respite in the execution of orders, that she may, with better leisure and quietness, commune with her said sisters; promising, in the mean season, to order them in such religious wise, that there shall be no such resort as hath been of late accustomed. The succeeding Abbess, however, brought these refractory ladies into much better order. But she, too, pleads with Wolsey for some little relaxation of strict rule; namely, licence that any of the nuns, "when their father, mother, brother, or sister, or any such nigh of their kin, come unto them, may have leisure to speak with them in the hall in her presence, or that of her Prioress, and other two discreet sisters;" and, also, that in consideration of the administration of temporalities of the house, "which is in great debt, and requireth much reparation and good husbandry," he would permit her, "being associate with one or two of the said discreet sisters of the house," "to lie forth of her monastery," when business absolutely prevented her return the same day; as she assured him, that the said husbandry could not be done "so well by any other overseer as by her own person." A noble lady, also, remonstrates against the enforcement of the new rules upon a house of



Monks in Bristol, where she, a poor widow, had what she considered a lodging "most meetest to serve God in her old days," from which she was likely to be excluded by the new rule, that "no woman shall come within the precincts of the same." She faithfully promises that she and her women will be "of such governance that no inconvenience shall ensue thereof." "And where hereto," she adds, "I have used from my house to go the next way to the church, for my ease, through a cloister of the same to a chapel that I have within the quire of the same, I shall be content from henceforth, if it shall so seem convenient unto you, to forbear that, and to resort to the common place, like others do, of the same church." \* Another Abbess bribes Cromwell to permit her to re-open a back-gate in her monastery, the closure of which, she declares, causes her visitors to go two miles about.

Every conceivable device was laid hold of, to accomplish the suppressions by other than forced means. The convents were forbidden to receive fresh inmates, on pain of the royal displeasure; and any transgression, on the part of the Superior, was considered to forfeit the house into the King's hands. The following royal mandate gives an idea of the summary mode of proceeding: it relates to the abbey of Whalley, in Lancashire, and was addressed by the King to his Commissioners:—

"Whereas, upon the execution of the Abbot of Whalley, ye have taken order for the good direction of the house, and the safe keeping of the goods, without embezzlement, till further knowledge of our pleasure; approving much your good foresight hereof, we have thought convenient to signify unto you, that, forasmuch as it appeareth that the house of Whalley hath been so sure corrupt, amongst other, that it should seem there remaineth very few therein that were meet to remain and continue in such an incorporation; we think it shall be meet that some order be taken for the removal of the Monks now being in the same, and that we should take the whole house into our own hands, as by our laws we be justly, by the attainder of the said late Abbot, entitled unto it, and so devise for such a new establishment thereof as shall be thought meet for the honour of God, our surety, and the benefit of the country. Wherefore our pleasure is, that you shall, with good dexterity, lay unto the charges of all the Monks there their grievous offences towards us and our Commonwealth, and therewith essay their minds, whether they will conform themselves gladly, for the redubbing of their former trespasses, to go to other houses of their coat, where they shall be well entreated; or else whether they will rather take capacities, and so receive secular habit. Albeit, we require you so to move them to enter into other houses, that they may choose the same; for we think it cannot be wholesome for our Commonwealth to permit them to wander abroad; and therefore we require you to frame them to that point, that they may enter into other places, as is aforesaid; wherein you shall do unto

\* "Letters," &c., vol. ii., p. 160.

us good service, desiring you to advertise us of this matter with all diligence. As touching the order of the house in the mean time, we desire and pray you to have special regard that nothing be embezzled, and to lie in a good await of the Monks, that they conspire not to the brewing of any inconvenience."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 540.

Efforts were sometimes made to obtain a transmutation of the monasteries into institutions for the benefit of learning. Audeley writes to Cromwell,—

"Such bruit hath run since my last departing from your good Lordship, concerning the dissolution of the abbeyes of Saint John's in Colchester, and Saint Osyth's, that I am bold to write to your good Lordship, after mine old suit, for the continuance of the said two places; not as they be, religious, but that it might please the King's Majesty, of his goodness, to translate them into Colleges, after such sort and ordinances as shall seem most charitable to His Highness; for the which, as I said to you afore, His Grace may have of either of them a £1,000; that is, for both, £2,000, and the gift of the Deans and Prebendaries at his own pleasure."—*Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 587.

The breaking up of the monasteries brought about many disclosures in reference to the relics which had been regarded with such veneration, and from which some houses had derived enormous wealth, by substituting false plate and jewels for those offered by the devotees, and selling the real, or hiding it in secret recesses of the convent. The following notes record the result of inquisitorial visits to Glastonbury and Winchester:—

"Pleaseth it your Lordship to be advertised, that, since our letters last directed unto you from Glastonbury, we have daily found and tried out both money and plate, hid and mured up in walls, vaults, and other secret places, as well by the Abbot as other of the convent, and also conveyed to divers places in the country. And, in case we should here tarry this fortnight, we do suppose daily to increase in plate and other goods, by false knaves conveyed. And, among other petty briberies, we have found the two Treasurers of the church, Monks, with the two Clerks of the vestry, temporal men, in so arrant and manifest robbery, that we have committed the same to the jail."—*Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 619.

"Pleaseth your Lordship to be advertised, that this Saturday, in the morning, about three of the clock, we made an end of the shrine here at Winchester. There was in it no piece of gold, nor one ring, or true stone, but all great counterfeits. Nevertheless, we think the silver alone thereof will amount near to two thousand marks. We have also received into our possession the cross of emeralds, the cross called Jerusalem, another cross of gold, two chalices of gold, with some silver plate, parcel of the portion of the vestry; but the old Prior made the plate of the house so thin, that we can diminish none of it, and leave the Prior any thing furnished. We found the Prior and all the convent very conformable, having assistants with us at the opening of our charge to the same,—the Mayor, with eight or nine of the best of his brethren, the Bishop's Chancellor, Mr. Doctor Craiford, with a good appearance of honest personages besides; who, with one voice,

most heartily gave laud and praise to God, and to the King's Majesty, thinking verily that they do all as much rejoice of His Majesty's godly and most Christian purpose herein as can be devised. We have, also, this morning, viewed the altar, which we purpose to bring with us. It will be worth the taking down, and nothing thereof seen; but such a piece of work it is, that we think we shall not rid it, doing our best, before Monday night or Tuesday morning. Which done, we intend, both at Hide and St. Mary's, to sweep away all the rotten bones, that be called 'relics;' which we may not omit, lest it should be thought we came more for the treasure, than for avoiding of the abomination of idolatry."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 621.

By far the wealthiest shrine in England was that of Thomas à Becket. The following extract records a visit paid to it, just before its removal, by a French lady, Lady Montreuil:—

"At ten of the clock, she, her gentlewomen, and the said Ambassadors (of France), went to the church, where I showed her Saint Thomas's shrine, at the which she was not a little marvelled of the great riches thereof, saying to be innumerable, and that, if she had not seen it, all the men in the world could never have made her to believe it; thus overlooking and viewing, more than an hour, as well the shrine as Saint Thomas's head, being at both set cushions to kneel, and the Prior, opening Saint Thomas's head, saying to her three times, 'This is Saint Thomas's head,' and offered her to kiss it; but she neither kneeled nor would kiss it, but was still viewing the riches thereof: so she departed, and went to her lodging to dinner."—*Miscellaneous Letters, Second Series*, vol. xxxvi., p. 241.

Cranmer writes to Cromwell to investigate St. Thomas's shrine, and adds,—

"Farther, because that I have in great suspect, that Saint Thomas of Canterbury's blood, in Christ church in Canterbury, is but a feigned thing, and made of some red ochre, or of such like matter, I beseech Your Lordship that Doctor Lee, and Doctor Barbour my Chaplain, may have the King's commission to try and examine that and all other like things there."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 580.

With the removal of the shrine, the primary ground of offence, however, Thomas à Becket did not cease to excite uneasiness. A Curate records being at a church, where,—

"On the north side of the church, I espied certain windows, wherein is pictured the life of Saint Thomas: in especial, I noted a superstitious Popish remembrance in the absolution of the King that was in that time, that is thus set forth: there be divers Monks portrayed with rods in their hands, the King kneeling naked before a Monk, as he should be beaten, at the shrine of Saint Thomas. This manner I have seen in divers places, and have heard pardoners set forth, in the declaration of the pardon of Saint Thomas, divers points wherefore he was slain, in that he did resist the King at that time: one is, that he would not grant that whosoever set his child to school should pay a tribute; also, that no poor man should eat certain meats except he paid a tribute; also, that Priests or Clerks should be judged of any layman, whom they call Secular Judges. These words, with

divers other, remaining in the people's heads, which they call the Articles of Saint Thomas and Liberties of the Church of England, with such pictures, shall be a great hinderance to the contentation of the King's subjects, unless by your wisdom you be good helper herein."—*Miscellaneous Letters, Second Series*, vol. xvi., p. 49.

An adherent to Romanism writes in a melancholy strain to his mistress, Lady Lisle, then at Calais:—

"The most part of saints, whereunto pilgrimages and offerings were wont to be made, are taken away. Our Lady of Southwark is one, Saint Saviour, the Blood of Hayles, and others. I doubt the Resurrection will after."

"This day" (July 18th, 1538) "our late Lady of Walsingham was brought to Lambeth, where was both my Lord Chancellor and my Lord Privy Seal, with many virtuous Prelates; but there was offered neither halfpenny nor candle: what shall become of her, is not determined."

Few superstitions had so strong a hold upon the popular feelings as our Lady of Walsingham. After the removal of the image, a rumour of a miracle just performed by it was spread abroad, and jealously traced back, by an assiduous Magistrate, to its author, a woman of the place, who was committed to ward.

"The next day," writes our informant, "I caused her to be set in stocks,—in the morning, and about nine of the clock, when the said market was fullest of people,—with a paper set about her head, written with these words upon the same, 'A REPORTER OF FALSE TALES,' she was set in a cart, and so carried about the market-stead, and other streets in the town, staying in divers places, where most people assembled, young people and boys of the town casting snowballs at her. This done and executed, she was brought to the stocks again, and there set till the market was ended. This was her penance; for I knew no law otherwise to punish her but by discretion, trusting it shall be a warning to other light persons in such wise to order themselves. Howbeit, I cannot perceive but the same image is not yet out of some of their heads."

It was evidently a fresh experience to the English autocrat, that the superstitions of ages were not to be uprooted at his bidding, and that it could be considered at all *outré* in him to punish those observances, the absence of which, a few years before, would have been equally, or still more severely, chastised.

"It may also like you to know," writes Audeley to Cromwell, "that there is a book come forth in print touching the taking away of images, which I send you; praying you to know, whether ye be privy to the setting forth thereof. I insure you, in the parts where I have been, some discord there is, and diversity of opinions, amongst the people, touching worshipping of saints and images, and for creeping at cross, and such like ceremonies, heretofore used in the Church; which discord were good should be put to silence. Whereupon I pray you I may be advertised, whether ye know it or not; for I intend to send for the printer, and stop them; but there be many abroad. It were good that the

Preachers and the people abstained from opinions of such things, till such time as by the report of such as the King's Highness hath appointed, for searching and ordering of laws of the Church, his Grace may put a final order in such things, how his people and subjects may use themselves without contention."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 447.

The numerous classes of persons, whose interests were intrinched upon by these reforms, murmured sorely against them. The Friars Mendicant, more especially, went about with grave looks amongst their friends and supporters, accosting them with a solemn shake of the head:—

"Father, (or, Sister,) what a world is this! It was not so in your fathers' days. You may see here is a perilous world: they will have no pilgrimage; they will not we should pray to saints or fast, or do any good deeds. Our Lord have mercy on us! I will live as my forefathers have done. I am sure your father and friends were good, and you have followed them hithertoward: therefore, I pray you, continue as you have done, and believe as your friends and fathers did, whatsoever these new fellows do say."—*Miscellaneous Letters, Second Series*, vol. xlv., p. 49.

In this state of affairs, it will not be matter of surprise, that England was reputed abroad to be wholly given over to the new doctrines. Cromwell informs his master,—

"That there arrived yesterday one Hieronymo, an Italian of Sienna, a man of much outward simplicity, and as weak learning, as far as I can perceive. He fled the persecution of the Papists in Italy, and went to Wittenberg, where he hath been but a little season; yet, nevertheless, he hath letters of commendation from Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Kreutziger, Oziander, and other learned men, and therewith some letters to my Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and to Your Grace's Chaplain, Mr. Thixtill. The simplicity of the man, and his rude apparel and behaviour, show the man not to be, in my judgment, greatly suspected. I have sent him to the said Archbishop, as well for to judge of his learning, as also for to help him as he shall see cause."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 611.

The Flemish Ambassador, Pate, writing to Norfolk from Bruges, July 12th, 1540, a few months after the fall of Cromwell, says,—

"Your Grace shall understand that, all the while Thomas Cromwell ruled, there were such slanders and obloquies of our realm, as might be, to a true Englishman hearing the same, a great grief; some pronouncing the blessed sacrament of the altar was utterly abolished with us; some affirming that we never observed holydays, nor regarded saints, as we had none of their images standing within our churches; and some said that we no more fasted than dogs; the Lent abrogated, so that all piety and religion, having no place, was banished out of England; whither, some purposing to go, said they would carry their Chaplain with them, to say them Mass in their chambers, thinking they could have no place in the church so to do; but when they heard me declare the contrary,—to whom such kind of questions were moved



of those that were desirous to know the truth,—giving to my word credit, and seeing my servants of an honest life, and conforming themselves to the laws of God, they began to bless them, as so lightly deluded by common rumours, that now, lauded be his Majesty, waxeth so weak and feeble every where, as I trust they shall perish with their author, a plain Gentile, a traitor, and an heretic. This I write to your Lordship to the intent you may perceive what service that wretch did our Sovereign Lord, that neither regarded his master's honour, nor his own honesty."—*State Papers*, vol. viii., p. 397.

"He that is low need fear no fall;" and, Cromwell once down, it became the fashion to accuse him of every description of crime and misdemeanour. One amongst other charges was that he had presumed to aspire to the hand of the King's elder, but then illegitimatized, daughter, the Lady Mary. Wallop, the English agent at Paris, reporting a conversation with Cardinal du Bellay, writes:—

"He showed me further than he did before, and that the said Privy Seal's intent was to have married my Lady Mary; and that the French King and he had much debated the same matter, three quarters of a year past, reckoning at length, by the great favour Your Majesty did bear to him, he should be made some Earl or Duke; and thereupon presumed your said Majesty would give to him in marriage the said Lady Mary, your daughter, as before-time you had done the French Queen unto my Lord of Suffolk. These things they gathered of such bruits as they had heard of the said Privy Seal before, knowing him to be fine-witted, in so much as at all times, when any marriage was treated of for my said Lady Mary, he did always his best to break the same. All these things considered together, the said French King and Cardinal conceived in their heads, he minded surely at length to have had the said Lady Mary, and thereby to come to all his determined evil purposes. As to the Ambassador of Portugal, I have done my best to know of whom he heard first the said bruits; he protesting by a great oath, that he could not call it to his remembrance, but heard it often communed of, among Ambassadors, two years past, and, in a manner, had forgotten the same, saving now hearing of the said Privy Seal's abominable determination, which did put him somewhat in memory thereof."—*Ibid.*, p. 379.

The rumour that any subject had ventured to entertain the bare idea of marrying his daughter, enraged the King, and he bade his agent strongly to affirm,—

"That neither we go about nor intend to marry our said daughter at home, in such sort as he pre-supposed unto you; nor that there is any man within our realm that dare presume to press or persuade us thereunto; but rather that we bear such natural and entire affection to our said daughter, as, when we shall happen to bestow her, it shall well appear that we have no less regard to our honour and the advancement of our blood than appertaineth."—*Ibid.*, p. 455.

Henry VIII. had bandied about the name and rights of his daughter, to pander to his own disgraceful passions; but he

would permit no one to trifle with her save himself. The same temperament pervaded his conduct in other respects: he could act the boon companion amongst his courtiers, with a complete abandon of the exclusiveness of royalty; but woe to the man that, for an instant, presumed upon his Sovereign's freedom! A certain man, named William Webb, got into trouble for reporting that, as

—"he rode upon a good gelding, and a fair gentlewoman behind him, the King's Grace met him, and said unto him, 'Whom hast thou behind thee there, Will?' and he made answer again, saying, 'A friend of mine, an it like Your Grace.' And with that the King stepped to her, and plucked down her muffler, and kissed her, saying, 'Well, Will, thou art never without such fair stuff about thee; but we will give her a gown of damask, for thy sake, and see she have it.'"

The anecdote was true, and not denied; but the repetition of it gave offence.

On one occasion, Cromwell feared to repair to Court without special leave, because a man in his house had died under circumstances suspicious of plague. The King said he might repair to Court safely enough within a day or two; but when he talked to the Queen (Jane Seymour) about it, her countenance betrayed alarm; and as the King had his own reasons for wishing to remove every cause of anxiety from her, he said it would be better for Cromwell to stay at the house of some friend in the neighbourhood, without coming to the palace;—

"And to meet with His Grace at hunting, and keep him company all day till night, and then to repair to where you shall be lodged, till such time as His Grace and you shall perceive further in the matter; assuring your Lordship, that His Grace is very sorry that the chance happened so now that ye might not be here to make good cheer, as we all do, and the King, who useth himself more like a good fellow than like a King among us that be here; and, thanked be God, I never saw him merrier in his life than he is now."—*Miscellaneous Letters, Second Series*, vol. xxxvi., p. 288.

The King was passionately fond of hunting, and his favourites were frequently presented with game killed by the royal hand. The two following are from courtiers to Wolsey:—

"And forasmuch as, in your journey, ye shall not by chance have always venison after your appetite, His Highness hath sent unto Your Grace at this time a red deer, by a servant of his own; and that, not because that it is a deer excellent, but forasmuch as it is at this time novelty, and dainty, and moreover slain of his own hand."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 209.

"The King's Highness commendeth him heartily unto Your Grace, and sends unto Your Grace, by this bearer, the greatest red deer that was killed by His Grace, or any of his hunters, all this year. Yesterday His Highness took marvellous great pain in hunting of the red

deer, from nine of the clock in the morning to seven of the clock at night; and, for all his painstaking, he, nor all his servants, could kill no more than this one, notwithstanding they hunted in four several parts."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 325.

His sports did not, however, divert the King's attention from business, in which he frequently interfered to an extent annoying to the officials. Secretary Pace, writing to Wolsey on one occasion, says,—

"And as for one of my letters, which was unto Your Grace very displeasing, as it appeared by your answer to the same, I had, at that time, devised a letter in the same matter, far discrepant from that ye received; but the King would not approve the same, and said, that he would himself devise an answer to Your Grace's letters sent to him at that time, and commanded me to bring your said letters unto his privy chamber, with pen and ink, and there he would declare unto me what I should write. And when His Grace had your said letters, he read the same three times, and marked such places as it pleased him to make answer unto, and commanded me to write and to rehearse, as liked him, and not further to meddle with that answer. So that I herein nothing did but obeyed the King's commandment, as to my duty appertaineth, and especially at such time as he would, upon good grounds, be obeyed, whosoever spake to the contrary."—*Ibid.*, p. 79.

The King was accustomed to manage the Parliament by paying the Speaker, and even Sir Thomas More, with all his single-heartedness, accepted the remuneration; whilst the commonalty had but small share in any political duty, beyond that of blindfold obedience.

"And, Sire," writes Wolsey to Henry VIII., "where it hath been accustomed that the Speakers of the Parliaments, in consideration of their diligence and pains taken, have had, though the Parliament hath been right soon finished, above the £100 ordinary, a reward of £100, for the better maintenance of their household, and other charges sustained in the same; I suppose, Sir, that the faithful diligence of the said Sir Thomas More, in all your causes treated in this your late Parliament, as well for your subsidy right honourably passed, as otherwise considered, no man could better deserve the same than he hath done; wherefore, your pleasure known therein, I shall cause the same to be advanced unto him accordingly."—*Ibid.*, p. 124.

Cromwell, writing to Henry VIII. on the election of a Member of Parliament, says,—

"Amongst others, for Your Grace's Parliament, I have appointed Your Majesty's servant, Mr. Morrison, to be one of them; no doubt, he shall be ready to answer, and take up such as would crack or face with literature of learning, or by indirected ways, if any such shall be, as I think there shall be few or none; forasmuch as I and other your dedicate Counsellors be about to bring all things so to pass, that Your Majesty had never more tractable Parliament. I have thought the said Morrison very meet to serve Your Grace

therein; wherefore I beseech the same to have him in your good favour, as ye have had hitherto. I know his heart so good, that he is worthy favour indeed."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 603.

The election of Knights of the Shire, as Members of Parliament, long considered a troublesome tax on the wealthier gentry, was now beginning to rank as a privilege, though with but a glimmering perception of its ultimate importance. The following is, perhaps, the earliest record in existence of a "contested election," and shows us how those matters were managed three hundred years ago: it is from the mother of the disappointed candidate:—

"Pleaseth it your master to be advertised, that at the coming down of the King's writ in *Salopshire* (Shropshire) to the Sheriff, to choose the Knights for the Parliament, there were of the worshipful of the shire, with the Justices, that sent unto me, and willed me to make labour that my son, George Blount, should be one of them; and so I did, my son being at the Court; and moreover, the shire laboured the Sheriff that the election should not be appointed at Shrewsbury, because the plague reigned there so sore; but in any wise the Sheriff would it should be there, to the intent that the inhabitants burgesses, with the franchise of the town, should assemble themselves to choose one Trentham; and so they assembled themselves riotously, that the worshipful of the shire were not content, (saying their voice cannot be heard,) and had much to do to keep the King's peace. Whereupon they titled their names, and went to the Sheriff, willing him to return George Blount, for they would have no other; but in any wise he would not, because the Under-Sheriff is a dweller in the said town: and then the gentlemen delivered their names to this bearer, being an honest gentleman, to make report, who can advertise you more plainly than I can write, (to whom it may please you to give credence,) beseeching you to be good master unto my son in this, as you have been unto me, and all those that mine be, at all times."—*Letters, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 168.

A great disproportion existed between the former and the present value placed upon the courtly, but purely honorary, distinctions which the King alone had power to bestow; a disproportion easily accounted for, when we find that the King endeavoured to replenish his empty exchequer by a compulsory sale of these honours. He issued a mandate for all who possessed landed property to the value of £40 a year, equivalent to about £200 of our present money, to come up to Court and receive the honours of knighthood, by paying certain fees into the Royal Exchequer. This mandate sorely disquieted many of the proposed recipients of chivalrous rank. The Princess Mary wrote to Cromwell on behalf of the father of one of her servants resident in Cheshire, begging that he might be excused, on account of the distance, and of his age,—upwards of fourscore years; and the Countess Dowager of Oxford excuses one of her

servants, who is willing to take oath that his land is worth but £38:—

"And as for husbandry or other provisions, he occupieth none, but liveth only upon his land; nor he hath no fashion to provide otherwise; for he hath always been a serving-man, and hath continued in my Lord my husband's service this twenty years."—*Letters, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 67.

In the following extract, we have an account of the first attempt made in England to establish Parish Registers, and the alarm which it created amongst the people:—

"It is now come to my knowledge, this 20th day of April, by a right true honest man, a servant of mine, that there is much secret and several communications amongst the King's subjects; and that many of them, in sundry places within the shires of Cornwall and Devonshire, be in great fear and mistrust what the King's Highness and his Council should mean, to give in commandment to the Parsons and Vicars of every parish, that they should make a book, and surely to be kept, wherein to be specified the names of as many as be wedded, and the names of them that be buried, and of all those that be christened. Now ye may perceive the minds of many: what is to be done, to avoid their uncertain conjectures, and to continue and stablish their hearts in true natural love, according their duties, I refer to your wisdom. Their mistrust is, that some charges, more than hath been in times past, shall grow to them by this occasion of registering of these things; wherein, if it shall please the King's Majesty to put them out of doubt, in my poor mind, shall increase much hearty love."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 612.

We find the administration of justice capricious and insecure, and frequently retarded, or interfered with by private interests. One correspondent complains bitterly of the injustice done to a servant who, in a drunken frolic, had spoken disrespectfully of the King, and, although clearly acquitted of wilful misdemeanour by a jury of his countrymen, was still kept in prison, "not only to the great loss and destruction of his goods, but also to the destruction and making lame his limbs." Great rigour was often exercised against such parties as expressed freely their opinions respecting the King's conduct; for Henry VIII. was too conscious of deserving censure, to be able to endure it with tolerance. Nor was he more patient of practical offences which bore upon himself personally. Discovery was made of a design, on the part of some thieves, to break open the gate of Windsor Castle, and plunder the building, the King being absent from London. It was betrayed to the Earl of Hertford, who allowed the miscreants, in fancied security, to proceed to the perpetration of their crime, and then apprehended them in the very fact; and, after examining them apart, committed them to Newgate. The King was informed of these facts, and expressed some discontent at the leniency of the proceeding, and at the whole affair not being made of more importance:—



"His Highness hath commanded us to signify unto you, that he doth much marvel, both that you write so slenderly in it, without sending hither the examinations, and that you have committed the thieves to common prisons, as though you made *no difference* betwixt the enterprise of the robbing of *His Majesty*, and the attempting of a like act towards *any his mean subjects*! His Majesty thinketh they should rather have been committed to the Tower, there to have remained upon further examination; though percase you think you have gotten out the bottom of their purpose."—*State Papers*, vol. i., p. 684.

One of the most serious impediments to justice was the insolence of the nobility, who did not hesitate to hector and threaten, and even to interfere with their armed forces, when their passions or their interests impelled. John Barlow, Dean of Westbury College, summoned several inhabitants of the village of Yate, in Gloucestershire, to appear before the Sessions, for playing at tennis-ball during church-hours on the Sunday.

"But," he adds, "at my coming to the said Sessions, there was such a band of the said Lady Berkeley's servants and retainers, being common jurors all,—as she hath no small number of such,—and were impanelled the same time in juries there, rather to let (hinder) than to prefer justice, as I then mistrusted, and as most commonly they used to do; for fear of the same, I thought it good to defer the setting forth of the said matter till the coming of the Justices of the Assize; wherewith the said Lady Berkeley, upon knowledge given to her of the same, greatly being displeased, uncharitably railed, with many slanderous and opprobrious words, against me, in the presence of diverse gentlemen, wishing that the said evil-disposed persons had beaten me, saying that I should have been well beaten indeed, if she had had knowledge before of my coming thither; and further, with threatening words, said at the same time, that *she* would sit upon my skirts!"—*Letters, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 211.

When a Nobleman, at the head of a small army of retainers, chose to break out into acts of violence, and revenge his own quarrels, it was indeed difficult for the feeble and terrified magistracy to prevent him; and recourse was usually had to the King or his Minister. A Dowager Countess of Oxford thus appeals against the lawless conduct of her husband's successor, who, on two separate occasions, broke into her park, at the head of a large company, and shot down upwards of a hundred of her deer. The Justice of Assize interfered, and bound both the Lord and the Lady over to keep the peace; but so far from fulfilling his pledge, the Earl, at the head of three hundred persons, broke into her house, beat her servants, and took forcible possession of her goods. She appealed to Wolsey; the Earl was severely remonstrated with, and a writ sent to the Justices of Cambridge-shire to keep him in order,—with what success, the Countess herself records, in a letter to her brother, the Duke of Norfolk, to whom she was compelled to appeal, that he might oppose might to might:—

"Please it your Grace to have knowledge that the writ which I had of my Lord Cardinal into Cambridgeshire doth nothing prevail me; for the Justices of Peace to whom the same was directed, with divers others of Peace of the same shire, were at the Castle of Camps, there to have *avoided* (turned out) all such persons as kept the same by force; but that notwithstanding, they answered them not to depart for no man, until such time as they had commandment from my Lord their master. And also the same Justices perceived themselves not able to remove them by their own power, nor yet with the raising of the country, without great disturbance of the King's peace, as they will justify at all times when they shall be called. They have not as yet proceeded no further in the execution of the said writ; wherefore, without your Grace help now, I know not how to obtain my possession again."—*Letters, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 13.

The amenities of domestic life, depending more upon individual character than upon the complexion of the age, were then, as now, ever varying. We find one unfortunate lady complaining that her husband has kept her three or four years "a prisoner alone, and continually locked up in one of the towers of his castle," in constant danger of poisoning, which makes her fear to taste even the scanty allowance of food sent to her.

"Wherefore," she adds, "I have been, and yet am, fain to drink water, or else I should die for lack of sustenance, and *had*, long ere this time, had not poor women of the country, of their charity, knowing my Lord's demeanour always to his wives, brought me, to my great window, in the night, such meat and drink as they had, and gave me, for the love of God; for money have I none wherewith to pay them, nor yet have had of my Lord these four years, save four groats."—*Ibid.*, p. 274.

Another lady, evidently a wilful, wayward termagant, and yet the mother of the gallant poet-courtier, Surrey, whom she stigmatizes as her "ungracious son," pours forth volleys of abuse against her unfortunate spouse, whom she represents as dragging her about by the hair, and subjecting her to all sorts of insult from the menials of his house. This was the result of a marriage against her will; for her love had previously been lavished on an earlier suitor, who was rejected by her father. Of a very opposite character is an epistle from a young lady, the sister of Queen Anne Boleyn, who had incurred the hot displeasure of both King and Queen, by contracting a stolen love-match with Sir William Stafford.

"After my poor recommendations, which is smally to be regarded of me, that am a poor banished creature, this shall be to desire you to be good to my poor husband and to me. I am sure it is not unknown to you the high displeasure that both he and I have, both of the King's Highness and of the Queen's Grace, by reason of our marriage without their knowledge, wherein we both do yield ourselves faulty, and do acknowledge that we did not well to be so hasty nor so bold, without

their knowledge. But one thing, good Master Secretary, consider,—that he was young, and love overcame reason; and, for my part, I saw so much honesty in him, that I loved him as well as he did me, and was in bondage, and glad I was to be at liberty; so that, for my part, I saw that all the world did set so little by me, and he so much, that I thought I could take no better way, but to take him and forsake all other ways, and live a poor honest life with him. For well I might have had a greater man of birth and a higher; but I assure you I could never have had one that should have loved me so well, nor a more honest man; and, besides that, he is both come of an ancient stock, and again as meet (if it was His Grace's pleasure) to do the King's service, as any young gentleman in his Court."—*Letters, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 194.

As pendant to the above picture, we will place a few curious extracts from the domestic correspondence of Lord Lisle, Governor of Calais, and his lady, during a visit paid by the latter to England. Announcing her safe arrival to "her own sweet-heart," Lady Lisle adds, "I should have been much merrier if I had been coming towards you, or if you had been with me. Your absence and my departure maketh heavy; also, for that I departed at the stair of Calais so hastily, without taking my leave of you accordingly, made me very sorry; but I assure you, my Lord, that I thought you had been in the boat, and would have brought me to the ship." She ends by assuring her husband that she should think every hour ten, till she was with him again. Referring to the business which brought her to England, she writes, "I shall from time to time certify you how I shall prosper and succeed in all my affairs and doings, wherein I trust you shall not find me slack, but shall well know me to use such diligence as one should do, whose whole heart and mind will never be settled nor established till the body be returned unto you." Before parting, the husband made a promise rather precipitate, that he would show his sorrow for his wife's absence by keeping himself very much in retirement. She heard, however, of his having been at a *fête* in the town, and rallied him on his breach of faith. "Fain would I be with you," she writes, "notwithstanding you promised me that after my departing you would dine at ten of the clock every day, and keep little company, because you would mourn for mine absence; but I warrant you I know what rule you keep, and company, well enough, since my departing, and what thought you take for me; whereof you shall hear at my coming home." To mitigate the apprehensions of the curtain lecture, she assures him that this quarrel she makes him is but her fantasy, and subscribes herself, "her that is more yours than her own, which had much rather die with you there, than live here."

Lord Lisle, in his replies, apologizes that the pressing civilities of his neighbours prevent his mourning by day, but that at night he sleeps not an hour for lack of her, and never sleeps at all

after two o'clock in the morning! A lady who was at the *fête* which had caused this fit of mock jealousy, assures Lady Lisle that her good Lord drank to her health in a full bumper, "and my Lord said that he thought the time long of your absence, and would for no good that you should lack him so long again, if it might otherwise be." Again, the loving Lady Lisle says, "And where you write that you never longed so sore for me as you now do, I assure you, my good heart-root, your desire in that behalf can be no vehementer than mine is; for I can neither sleep, nor eat, nor drink, that doeth me good; my heart is so heavy and full of sorrow, which, I know well, will never be lightened till I be with you, which I trust shall be shortly." Her Lord replied, that "never child longed for its nurse as he does for her;" and after a month's absence, in which she had written him more than a dozen letters, and they had exchanged various presents, she returned to Calais. This lady was as notable as she was loving. Her husband's affairs were much left to her guidance. She exacted from him a strict account of all his expenditure, and so completely controlled it, that he had to plead very earnestly to be permitted to have a new doublet against Christmas; whilst his gowns, hosen, shirts, &c., were all selected and provided by her.

The position of a widow in the higher classes was often fraught with much discomfort, as the selection of a second husband generally devolved upon the King; and he was not very scrupulous in the choice, if the widow were richly jointured, and he could sell his influence over her at a fair price.

Lord Dacre thus addresses Wolsey concerning one of "the King's widows:"—

"My Lord, I humbly thank your Grace that you have stopped the coming up of the Lady Pickering, late wife to Sir Christopher Pickering, Knight; which (if it might so stand with the King's high pleasure, seeing that she is his widow) I would have her in marriage, and have his gracious letters of consent to the same. And if His Highness have made any grant to any other person, I will speak no more therein. Her substance is this: she hath under £40 by year, by reason of her late husband; and as for her goods, they are of little value, and how, and in what case as her father's land standeth in, seeing that she hath issue, I cannot perfectly advertise Your Grace. The labour that I have made unto Your Grace concerning her was more for love than for any profit."—*Wolsey Correspondence*, vol. iv., p. 11, *State-Paper Office*.

But royalty itself could not always lord it over the affections of these experienced dames. The following is a curious record of a courtship-scene, and its failure. The heroine is the same Lady Berkeley who had before defied the law in protecting her tennis-players, and empannelling her own tenants as jury-men. Her unsuccessful suitor was Edward, son and heir of John Lord

Dudley, a Nobleman notoriously poor. This circumstance *might*—such things have been known—influence the decision of her Ladyship. Dudley writes to Wriothesley as follows:—

“In my heartiest manner I recommend me unto you, ever heartily thanking you of your most singular goodness to me at all times, and in especial for the procurement and device of the King’s letters and my Lord Privy Seal’s, the which were as effectually devised in my behalf and preferment as I could either advise or desire. Notwithstanding, I have not been regarded according to the King’s desire and my Lord’s, but she hath made me a very light answer, that she is not minded to marry, and at the next time she will make an answer to the King, which is but done for a delay; whereby I am not able to follow my suit, unless you be good Lord unto me, to put your help with my Lady, my aunt, the bearer hereof, to speak unto my Lord that I may have some straiter command from the King and my Lord unto her, to go forward in the accomplishing my desire. The truth is, she entertained me, after the most loving sort, at my first coming to her, as I could desire; for, when she was in her chamber sewing, she would suffer me lie in her lap, with many other as familiar fashions as I could desire; also, she would bring me to my chamber, and send the gentlewomen unto me for to entertain me. But at my coming with the King’s letters, I was nothing so well welcomed; but where it was so familiar before, it was much stranger since my coming last, which grieved me sore, as well for her own part as for mine, considering the King’s pleasure and my Lord’s request. Howbeit, as far as I perceive by such of my friends as be about her, if my letters had been of commandment, as they were in desire and request, I should have obtained my heart’s desire without any further delay.

“Also, my desire is that it may be devised that the King and my Lord will see that I shall at all times use myself like an honest man unto her, or else that His Grace will see it remedied, trusting that I have not so little discretion for to use myself any way to her displeasure: there is too many discommodities would rise thereupon. Truly I love her not so weakly; but undoubtedly my heart is so faithfully assured unto her, that it were impossible to remove it for any pleasure in the world. And although it hath been expensive and chargeable unto me, the suit unto her, yet, an I were worth a thousand pounds, I would vouchsafe to spend it for her sake; wherefore you cannot do me a higher pleasure than to procure me a commandment whereby I may obtain her favour.”—*Letters*, vol. iii., p. 76.

The royal letters of recommendation were accordingly issued to Lady Berkeley, in terms stronger than before; but she declared that, although, if her *heart* were towards Mr. Dudley, she would rather receive a husband on the recommendation of the King and Cromwell than any other, yet, as it was not, she could not accept him; adding, that she had written to the King to signify “that I cannot with my heart be fair unto Mr. Dudley, to accomplish his high pleasure, and in semblance also desiring your good Lordship, in that my stomach cannot lean there, neither as yet to any marriage, that you will continue my especial good Lord, as



you have done in time past, and to be in help of my rude answer unto the King's Majesty, so that I may stand in no displeasure with His Grace."

Another widow, Margaret Lady Audeley, wrote to Cromwell in similar, but still more amusing, terms. Sir George Aylesbury had been sent to her in character of a suitor; but, either ignorant of his errand, or unwilling to appear to know it, she had made him good cheer, simply as a person come from the King. Cromwell wrote to thank her for this, which he considered a favourable omen of the success of the wooing; but she wrote back at once, declaring that she deserved no thanks for entertaining any, though it were the meanest, person that could come from His Majesty; adding, that,—

"For any intent or purpose of marriage, either to the said Aylesbury or any other living creature, as yet I have none. And if it shall chance me hereafter to have any such fantasy or mind, (which I pray God I may not have,) it is not *he* that I can find in my heart to take to my husband, of all creatures alive. And my trust is, that, as the King's Highness hath been always good and gracious Lord unto all other his poor widows, His Majesty will be so much my good and gracious Lord to give me liberty to marry, if ever it be my chance, such one as I may find in my heart to match unto; either else, undoubtedly, I am fully purposed to abide and continue in this estate during my life."—*Letters, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 270.

The minors were in still worse plight than the widows. Their wardship and marriage were commonly bought and sold; and a mother who really loved her child would not unfrequently pay a large sum of money, that he might become her ward. One lady informs us, "I bought my son of my Lord of Norfolk: I must give him £100, to the intent that I would marry my son to his comfort." Noblemen who had daughters frequently bought the wardship and marriage of minor Peers, as the best means of providing suitable sons-in-law; and, if the purchase-money for the husband were faithfully paid, an honorary obligation was thereby made out that the wife's jointure should not be curtailed nor impeded. In a series of angry letters from the Duchess of Norfolk to Cromwell, she complains, amongst other grievances, of the non-payment of her jointure. She urges that her husband had every reason to act differently, "seeing that my Lord my husband chose me himself, for my Lord my father had *bought* my Lord of Westmoreland for me, and had with me two thousand marks." And she mentions it as an extraordinary circumstance, that Queen Anne Boleyn, who, at that time, especially favoured the Duke of Norfolk, had procured for him the young Duke of Richmond as a husband for his daughter, the Lady Mary, and this "clear favour without any payment; for the King's Grace gat never a penny for my Lord of Richmond." One inconvenience resulting from this system was, that it became the interest

of the guardian to raise and extend the property of the eldest son, at the expense of the widow and younger children; since, the larger the jointure he could afford to assign to his bride, the higher would be the price realized for his sale in the matrimonial market. In consequence, we find complaints very numerous of the deprivations and injustice committed upon these more helpless members of the community. This system extended to the middle orders, where it was felt still more injuriously, as the right of wardship was often considered hereditary, or a perquisite of office. "Alas, my Lord!" exclaims one poor widow, suffering under this grievance; "this is an extreme fashion to use a poor woman; for, an they may have the heir and the land, they care not an I and the other children go a-begging." She thus details the circumstances of her case:—

"MY GOOD LORD,—

"Pleaseth your good Lordship to understand, that, fourscore years past, the Abbot of St. Alban's, that was in those days, had, wrongfully, my husband's grandfather to his ward. When he was fourteen years old, the Abbot sold him to a fishmonger of London, and he kept him two years; and then this child ran away from the fishmonger unto a Knight, one Sir Davy Phillip, which Knight married this child unto Mr. St. John's daughter, of Kent, and then the friends of his wife sued with the Abbot, and proved him not his ward. Then the Abbot gave him, in recompence for the wrongs he had done, a farm, which is called Ballard's, beside Luton, in Bedfordshire; but this young man was not contented with that gift. Then the Abbot gave him more, to have an end with him, and made him master of his game. This my father-in-law, Mr. Creke, and my husband did tell me many times; and yet there be old men in the country, and in Rickmansworth parish, that will say thus at this day. Whereupon I lowly desire your good Lordship's help, or else the Abbot that is now will do my children wrong; for he will not show his records, but doth say he will have my son to his ward, and I am not able to go to the law with him, nor never shall have end with him, except it will please your Lordship, of your abundant charity, to send for the Abbot to come afore your Lordship. He is now in London, in a house of his own, by the Charterhouse gate. And thus Jesu save your good Lordship!

"Your poor Beadwoman,

"JOANNA CREKE, Widow."

—*Letters, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 267.

Literature was so completely beyond the pale of ordinary life, that the slightest allusion to a book is a most rare occurrence, except as connected with the change of religion. Our glimpses of the state of science are still more imperfect, if, indeed, science may be said to have existed at all, in the modern acceptance of the term. The practice of surgery was encumbered with much superstition; and its true principles were so imperfectly understood, that experience was often found a

much better safeguard than professional skill, so called. We have an interesting detail, from the pen of a noble lady, of the modes she adopted to cure the fatal sweating-sickness, so prevalent in the summer of 1528. Her letter is addressed to Wolsey:—

"My Lord,—I beseech Your Grace to have me excused that I do write so boldly unto Your Grace; it is for my poor love unto Your Grace. My Lord, if it would please you, if that you have the sweat, from the which I pray God defend you, for to send me word. I shall send Hogon and William Hastings unto Your Grace, the which shall keep you as well as is possible, after the temperate fashion. I have the experience daily in my house of all manner of sorts, both good and bad; and, thanked be God, there is none miscarried, neither in my house nor within the parish that I am in. For if they that be in danger perceive themselves very sick, they send for such of my house as hath had it, and knoweth the experience, whereby, thanked be God, they do escape; and if they be sick at the heart, I give them treacle and water imperial, the which doth drive it from the heart; and thus have holpen them that have swooned divers times, and that have received the Sacraments of the Church; and divers doth swell at their stomachs, to whom I give setwell to eat, the which driveth it away from the stomach. And the best remedy that I do know in it, is to take little or no sustenance or drink, until sixteen hours be past. And, my Lord, such of your servants as have had it, let them not come about Your Grace of one week after. And thus I do use my servants, and I thank our Lord as yet I have not had it. Vinegar, wormwood, rosewater, and crumbs of brown bread, is very good and comfortable, to put in a linen cloth, to smell unto your nose, so that it touch not your visage. My Lord, I hear say that my Lord of Norfolk hath had the sweat, and that divers in his house are dead, and, as I think, through default of keeping."—*Letters, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 28.

Such was ENGLAND, three hundred years ago:—its King, a bluff, good-natured, but capricious and wilful, tyrant, ruling, where he could, with absolute sway, and, where he could not rule, crushing the daring resister of his will, were he Noble or peasant, and setting at defiance the laws and customs of Western Europe; its Ministry, if such it might be called, dependent upon, and cringing to, the will of the Prime Minister, who was always the personal favourite of the Sovereign; its Parliament little more than the tool of the Court; its Nobility often venal, disorderly, and violent, yet brave, and showing many examples of chivalric bearing; its Priesthood divided in opinion, corrupt in practice, receiving their *dicta* of faith from the lips of a Monarch, whose character was stained by the foulest crimes; its Commonalty ignorant, superstitious, impulsive, and easily carried away by designing plotters; its commerce circumscribed, its literature insignificant, its science hardly born. Who can recognise *our* England under such a guise? And what but the interfused ele-

ment of pure, religious, Protestant truth, spreading amongst the masses of a nation possessing intrinsically the seeds of that which is good and noble, could have produced, in the space of three centuries, a change much greater than had transpired in double that period previously? And now, if we look forward three centuries,—centuries during which “England expects every man to do his duty,”—who can foresee the point of religious, commercial, literary, and scientific elevation, which will form the mental vantage-ground of the future historian, who shall exercise his antiquarian predilections, and amuse his readers with a glimpse of ENGLAND UNDER QUEEN VICTORIA?

---

- ART. VIII.—1. *The Resources of New Granada.* By GENERAL MOSQUERA. New York: Dwight. 8vo.  
 2. *History of Yucatan: from its Discovery to the Close of the Seventeenth Century.* By CHARLES ST. JOHN FANCOURT, Esq. London: John Murray. 8vo.  
 3. *Travels on the Amazon and Rio Negro.* By A. R. WALLACE. London: Reeve and Co. 8vo.

SHADED maps have been recently employed to convey truth in colours. Two maps on this plan, adapted to the fertility and the present population of the globe, would effectually meet all the fears of the Malthusian philosophers. One would show that the world has never yet contained one-tenth of the number of inhabitants for whom provision has been made; and the other, that the disengaged portions equal the occupied regions in fertility, and excel them in magnitude. They would assure all men that the world was not modelled on too small a scale. The Creator of the earth counted all its inhabitants from the beginning, and his calculations are never erroneous.

We sympathize with those agricultural and economic writers who say that no European country is fully peopled; and we believe that more food could be, and will be, annually extracted, even from Britain or Belgium, than either has yielded hitherto: still, we can suppose a case of over-population in an island, or the corner of a continent, realizing all Malthusian horrors, but only from defective energy among the inhabitants, or the repression of commerce, and not from the want of means, or of room for men to live in the world.

The Old World's gardens and granaries in Western Asia have been, for long, only desolate and dreary wastes,—far-spreading cemeteries of mighty nations and numerous races,—with a few shepherds pitching their tents and leading their flocks, like watchers over the dead. The most fertile country of Eastern Europe is only now awaking, amid the tumult of a hostile

invasion, from a state of torpor. Africa—so long unknown to the commercial nations of the world, with the exception of the valley of the Nile, and a narrow ring around its shores—now, at this late period of history, also enters into the market of nations, and each passing year will materially enhance its resources. Australia, and the islands in its vicinity, are, in one respect, additions of this century to the world's wealth. They emerged from their hiding-place little more than half a century since; and ten years hence the three larger cities of Australia will probably contain a greater population than the three corresponding towns of the Russian Empire. India itself, with its one hundred and fifty millions of inhabitants, is not more than half cultivated; and it will yet support a larger and a happier population than those who now partially cover its plains.

America is not yet fully explored; and, although vast cities have been built on its Atlantic shores within two or three centuries, yet its industrial history has not passed the earlier chapters. The Southern is even less known than the Northern division of America. The South has gigantic mountains, whose slopes and table-lands would form kingdoms; and, concealed among their forests, or deep beneath their snows, the greatest rivers of the world have their sources: but the mountain lands have not been surveyed, the springs of its rivers have not been traced; although their banks have lovely regions, equal to Europe in extent, for Industry to cast its mantle over, as centuries pass away. South America has a great destiny; and the probable development of "its future" must not be measured by the slow progress of "its past." Europe is the world's school; and men commence the appropriation and improvement of new regions, with all the advantages of industrial and scientific experience, founded upon the knowledge acquired here, in which other continents and islands will participate.

Neutral agents often aid human progress. The merchant canvasses the world for sales, without considering himself a missionary of freedom: he seeks the enlargement of his fortune, without imagining that he works for the expansion of intellect and the extension of liberty. The man of science solves a problem in geography or geology, without believing that he is a pioneer of religion. Volney's "Ruins of Empires" was not written to prove the accuracy of the scriptural narratives; but the author's intentions have been frustrated, and his weapons turned against his cause.

Commerce, freedom, science, and religion, are remarkably associated. They advance together, even when their connecting links are imperceptible to careless observers. At other times they appear to follow antagonistic courses. The spirit of trade dissents from the spirit of patriotism; and the pride of science



despises the simplicity of the Gospel; but, even when they seem to be mutually divergent and divorced, their union is maintained, to re-appear and to vindicate its strength in promoting the highest interest of the world. The providence of God so overrules the plans and works of men, that freedom and truth follow closely, when they do not precede, the footsteps of commerce and science.

Europe was emerging from the feudal darkness and the spiritual tyranny of the Middle Ages; the empire of the Saracen had faded in Spain, and the great Reformation had dawned in the centre of the Continent; civil wars had broken the power of our insular nobility, and the enlightening influences of the Bible had partially penetrated into some quiet English parishes; when bands of loose adventurers, following the daring example of Columbus, crossed the Western Ocean, landed on the American coasts, and, aided by the arms and the military science of the Old World, submerged in ruins and slaughter the great empires of the Incas and the Montezumas. The Spanish conquerors of America did not discover in Mexico a people dwelling in peace and security, and then overwhelm them in the horrors of crime and conquest; but they found and nearly extirpated a race, who, at a then recent date, had exchanged a comparatively mild form of secular and spiritual government for bloody rites and debasing tyranny,—among whom great civil wars had previously existed, and murderous cruelties were daily practised, in the usual routine of an idol-worship. This fact forms no sound apology for the destroyers; and their guilt clings to their memory, and even to their posterity, while the latter pursue, so far as they are enabled, a similar course.

Francisco Pizarro, the bastard and foundling of Truxillo, had passed twenty years in South America before he left Panama, in 1528, to seek from the Spanish Court aid in effecting the conquest of Peru. Pizarro found Charles V., immediately after the great victory of Pavia, and before his installation as Emperor of Germany. Spain was at the moment the first European state: its Monarch was the first of European Sovereigns. He listened courteously, in the day of his greatest triumph, to the American adventurer; commended his cause to the prudence of his Indian Council and the sagacity of his Queen; and departed to receive from the Pontiff at Rome the imperial crown of Germany. Pizarro obtained the object of his long journey from the Spanish Court: he returned to Panama: he conquered Peru.

Three centuries have passed since then; but the close of the third found Peru independent, the riches of Spain squandered, its power subverted, and the country prostrated from its high place in Europe. The footsteps of the Spanish conquerors may yet be obliterated from the land which they covered with blood; and even their language may be vanquished, unless a great

change occur in the character and spirit of those who now represent Cortes and Pizarro,—the conquerors of Mexico and Peru, of the Incas and the Montezumas. The Anglo-Saxon race have annexed California and Texas, lately valuable provinces of Mexico; and they threaten to buy or to seize the entire Republic. Another war may bring their southern frontier forward to the Lake of Mexico. Annexation is a common passion to all the States of the great Republic; and is recommended as the means of conserving slavery in the Southern States. This besetting crime operates against Mexican independence, and the strong never want a pretext to attack the weak.

The Indian races are numerous in some provinces of Mexico. They have nearly re-conquered Yucatan. They exercise a powerful influence on all the frontiers; and some persons, intimately conversant with South America, say that it will again become the property of independent Indian nations. The Republics on the southern border of Mexico are obviously weak and disorderly. Their territories have been pervaded by large bodies of adventurers from the United States, since the discovery of gold in California. The commerce of Nicaragua has been improved by this invasion; but its independence is endangered, and its junction to the general Union of the North may not be distant. The Isthmus of Darien and Panama, the connecting link between North and South, between the Atlantic and the Pacific, is within the territory of New Granada; a country abounding in mineral wealth, and possessing grand commercial advantages. All its provinces are intersected by navigable rivers. Their climate, soil, and productions, from the height and magnitude of the mountains, combine all the varieties presented on the globe. The cultivatable land of the Republic equals, in breadth and length, France, Belgium, and Holland combined; and yet its population is little more than two and a half millions, although they have increased, during the present century, with greater rapidity than those of any other portion of America, not directly affected by immigration.

A change in the habits and principles of the Spanish Americans is necessary to prevent their absorption into the Anglo-Saxon or Indian races. Indications of that change are apparent in some quarters of South America. The Spanish Republicans celebrated the accomplishment of independence by the emancipation of their slaves,—an omen of future good, and even of mercy, to the Spanish race. The legislature of New Granada, although nominally Roman Catholic, has now disavowed bigotry and intolerance; and has vindicated, among its mountain chains, and upon its tropical rivers' banks, for the first time in the history of South America, the doctrine of religious freedom.

The modern history of Mexico clearly illustrates the necessity of religious freedom to national strength. The struggles of the

Colony with Spain produced an independence destitute of vigour. The institutions of the Republic wanted life. They were perfect in theory, so far as the political department extended, but weak in working. Mexico was, and even yet is, a political body without a soul. A territory strongly fortified by nature, was wrested from its effeminate and indolent possessors. Factions swept the land like foemen, wasting its might in their brief dictations. The Constitution was liberal; but politicians despised what they could not comprehend, and the people disregarded what they did not understand. Santa Anna, the present Dictator, an able soldier, has been three times banished, and he has returned for the third time to a contracted country, from which California and Texas have been severed. He has returned to sell another region for a few millions of dollars, and thus to bring the frontier of the United States nearer to Mexico, the most interesting city of the American continent.\* The sale is made under the pretence that the Spanish Americans cannot control the Indians; and if this avowed reason be founded in facts, we have a distinct proof that the Indians of the south are gaining upon the Spanish race. Santa Anna is intimately acquainted with the condition of Europe. He has read, travelled, and learned much. He is attached sincerely to his mountainous country, is an able soldier, and a shrewd politician. He is convinced that the natives of Mexico cannot resist the States. He cannot expect strength from Southern Europe. He looks, therefore, to the Central States of the European continent for immigrants; but many Germans are also Protestants. Santa Anna's studies have, however, taught him that Protestant nations are more prosperous than their rivals in Western Christendom. Proceeding upon that fact, and the necessity for a new immigration, he has repealed the statutes of religious uniformity; leaving a full and perfect toleration for all religious opinions, and every form of religious worship. This movement does not necessarily disconnect the Church from the State, but, as Santa Anna requires money, he will probably seize the revenues of the Church. He offers liberal terms to one hundred thousand German immigrants, who would undoubtedly revive the power of Mexico. In this case, the political necessities of the State have promoted the religious freedom of the subject. We fully admit that the decree by Santa Anna does not correspond in value to the legislation of New Granada, which it imitates, because the next Dictator may assume a different policy; but we do not fear retrogression in this respect; for the various immigrants will protect themselves, and the same political interests which dictated this change will preserve the freedom which it establishes. We also admit that the Mexicans have hitherto manifested an equitable

\* Since this passage was in type, we learn that the terms have not been accepted by the Senate of the United States.

and honest spirit in their transactions with European nations. Their indolence and consequent poverty, amid riches of the field and mine, are undeniable; yet they have not repudiated their large debt to Europe, and any defalcations connected with its settlement are fully explained by the rigorous pressure of want. They have given, in this particular, an excellent example to Spain and Portugal, and even to some of the richer States in North America. We therefore expect, under any future change of Government, adhesion, on their part, to the terms now offered to Protestant immigrants, which open Mexico, as we understand them, to the Bible, the school, the Missionary, and his tracts.

The religion of all the Spanish and Portuguese Colonies in America is nominally Roman Catholic, but often reduced in practice to a system of rough Heathenism, associated with all the crimes which constituted the worship of Venus in the ancient idolatries. Society in many South American cities is probably more immoral than in any other quarter of the world; and scandalous profligacy occurs under ecclesiastical sanction. Intelligent laymen deplore this degradation; and, even among the Priesthood, men may arise, to assert the rights of conscience, in vindicating the practice of good morals. A system of religion that has sunk to the patronage of low personal iniquity should not offer a formidable resistance to the Gospel, if its professors adopt proper means to publish these "glad tidings," in lands where they have been buried and hidden under the extreme rubbish even of European Popery.

The sincerity and zeal of individuals among the original Missionaries from Rome to the American continent, are undoubted. We cannot question the humanity of men who firmly, but often unsuccessfully, defended the helpless Indians against their oppressors, and sought to avert the miseries inflicted on the aborigines by Cortes, Pizarro, and their followers; who, with a cross in the left, and a sabre in the right, hand, accompanied by blood-hounds for Scripture-readers, offered the baptism of water, or of blood, to their victims, for whose worldly property and eternal salvation they exhibited a contending and nearly equal attachment; although the gold and silver had generally a preference over the souls of men.

We have equally little reason to doubt the infamous bigotry of other Priests, who resembled Father Valverde, when, in the square of Caxamalca, on the 29th of August, 1533, he gained an illustrious convert, Atahualpa, the last of the Incas, by the promise to substitute the *garrote* for faggots, in his judicial murder; or when he offered the cross, in the valley of Cuzco, to the Peruvian Chieftain, Chalcuchima, who perished by fire, refusing to profess "the religion of the white man, which he did not understand."

We are indebted to Roman Catholic Priests, who were supe-

rior to their system, for the wrecks of a great national history; but we are not therefore to forget that to their coadjutors and followers must be charged, with equal truth, the grand crime against science, that this history, which must have thrown additional light upon the transactions of mankind in the earlier ages, was reduced to fragments, and torn into wrecks.

The original instructions of the Court of Spain were not inhumane. Ferdinand and Isabella professed a very warm feeling towards the Indian nations. Officials were appointed with the power and title of "Protectors of the Indians." Excellent regulations were occasionally framed by the Council of the Indies. Indeed, the discoveries of Yucatan, and, subsequently, of Mexico, and other parts of the South American coasts, were the results of necessity. The Spaniards of Cuba required Indians to work their mines; and they were strictly prohibited from the employment of Cuban Indians, because their numbers had been greatly and rapidly reduced. The feeble authority of the Home Government was, however, eventually disregarded; and the Indians of Cuba and of Jamaica, before its capture by the English, were almost entirely extirpated.

Cortes himself began his life of discovery as a humane man. Adopting a motto from ancient Roman history, he commenced his voyage from Cuba to Yucatan with the intention not to disgrace it: "*Amici, crucem sequamur, et in hoc signo vincemus.*" Few Admirals have telegraphed a nobler message to their crews on the morning of some great undertaking; and Cortes acted well on his first voyage to Yucatan, although, before his second journey into the country,—when he ordered the Cacique of Tacuba to be tortured by rubbing the soles of his feet with oil, and placing them before a fire, "to induce him to confess his treason, and declare where the treasure of Montezuma was concealed,"—he must have forgotten the lessons of the Cross, if he had ever learned them.

The change of the Indians from their old mythology to nominal Christianity was easily effected. One set of superstitious observances was substituted for another, and in many instances without any manifest advantage. In Mexico, however, the new faith produced practice greatly superior to the bloody rites by which it was preceded. The worship of that country, before the arrival of Europeans, had been reduced to a carnival of demons. Human blood was more lavishly shed in Mexico, during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, to avert superhuman wrath, than in any other part of the world at any period in its history.\*

\* "In every tribe the captives taken in war were murdered with the most wanton cruelty, and afterwards devoured by the victors. Their religious rites were, if possible, still more horrid. The abominations of ancient Moloch were here outnumbered: children, virgins, slaves, and captives, bled on different altars to appease their gods.



The sun and the moon were the objects of Peruvian worship, which did not include similar cruelties. Although some authorities assert that human victims were sacrificed in Peru, yet the number was small, and the individuals were probably offenders against the law; while it is more probable still, that the victims on the Peruvian altars were confined to the irrational animals.

The "Yucatanese"—a term which includes different tribes, in many respects dissimilar, who inhabited Yucatan upon the arrival of the Spaniards—held at that comparatively recent date mythological traditions, partially resembling those of the Athenians during the life-time of St. Paul. Mr. Fancourt, in his *History of Yucatan*, which is drawn entirely from old, and to many classes inaccessible, works, states, that the Indians of Yucatan believed in one sole, formless Deity, who could not be represented, and of whom they worshipped no image. They also entertained the idea of a future state of being, with its punishments and rewards. They held, that man was originally made of earth and straw. They had added the straw in course of ages, to account for the existence of hair, which they could not explain as a production from the earth. So far, excepting the straw, original tradition had been preserved among them in an uncorrupted state. But to their "unknown" God they added many minor deities. The corruption of their worship followed that course. They did not absolutely forget the truth, but they grafted thereon imaginations of their own. These minor deities had temples, idols, altars, and Priests, steeped in human blood. One of the number was worshipped as the originator of writing. His mother was also worshipped as the first cultivator of cotton. Both acts were beneficent; yet men, women, and children were daily sacrificed in the temples of these idols. As the people also endeavoured to propitiate the principle of evil, we can comprehend the extent of human sacrifice involved in that superstition. The Yucatanese held slaves, they punished licentious crimes with extreme severity, they visited murder with death, and the laws relating to property were strict and simple. Their principles of social economy, in these particulars, resembled the Mosaic law; and they followed those practices in divination and witchcraft, which were common, at an early age, in Egypt, and may have originated on the Nile.

---

If there was a scarcity of human victims, the Priests announced that the gods were dying of thirst for human blood; and, to prevent a threatened famine, the Kings of Mexico were obliged to make war on the neighbouring states, to supply the altars. The prisoners of either side died by the hands of the Priests.....At the dedication of the temple of Vitzliputzli, (A.D. 1486,) 64,080 human victims were sacrificed in four days; and, according to the best accounts, their annual sacrifices required several thousands. The skulls of the victims sometimes were hung on strings which reached from tree to tree around their temples, and sometimes were built up in towers, and cemented with lime. In some of these towers Andrew de Tapia one day counted 136,000 skulls."—*Introduction to Mickle's Translation of the "Lusiad,"* vol. i., p. 15.

Cortes conquered Mexico many years before Pizarro invaded Peru; yet the Incas were ignorant of the fate, and even, probably, of the existence, of the Montezumas. Central and South America were originally peopled by one race, peaceable in their habits, and comparatively patriarchal in their worship. Another race, or a part of the same section of mankind, strengthened by a long residence in the north-western regions of America, swept over several southern states, especially Mexico, and introduced among their people the most terrible abuses of sacrificial rites that have ever existed; but one Mexican Monarch, not more than a hundred years before the Spanish invasion, employed language in prayer, that reminds us of the sublime terms which Job or Abraham, or even Moses, would have uttered. His belief in a future state was extremely clear, and that state perfectly pure. It was a heavenly state in the rigid meaning of the term. The records of this great King were, indeed, extricated from destruction by his direct descendant, who became acquainted with Christianity in Spain, but who would have found much difficulty in forming there the sublime ideas imputed by him to his ancestor. The literature and mythology of Mexico have been almost entirely lost to the world; and those readers who recall its traditions of the Deluge, and its still more wonderful pictorial representations of another event, in the paintings of the woman, the serpent, the tree, and the fruit, will concede that the loss may be one of the utmost importance, and eagerly hope for the possible exhumation of a Nineveh in the Western continent.

Mr. Wallace, in his "Travels on the Amazon and the Rio Negro," states, that the Indians on the higher banks of these great rivers ascribe the creation of the world to God; of whom, however, they have no definite idea, and to whom they offer no regular worship, although they employ, and remunerate richly, numerous *Pagès*, or "Heathen Priests," who appear to be pretenders to sorcery and witch or wizard craft; while the only prayer of the poor Indians is directed towards *Jurupari*, "the Evil Spirit," whom they endeavour to propitiate through these *Pagès*. Their Magicians or Priests claim no connexion with the Good Spirit, while they insist on the possession of a certain influence over the Spirit of Evil.

These Indians are far above the influence of the Roman Catholic Priests of the Brazils, although nominally on Brazilian ground; but they are nearer to Peru: and now, indeed, the Peruvian Government claims the banks and territory of the Upper Amazon; while they are still nearer to Bogota, the capital of New Granada, and more likely to be influenced from that city, than from any other town of South America. Bogota may, indeed, be regarded as the upper, and the only single, key of all those vast regions watered by the Amazon, the Magda-

lena, and the Orinoco, with their hundred tributaries, each equal to one of the great European rivers.

The original worship of the American Indians, like their political Government, was patriarchal in form, if not in spirit. The corruption of religion was probably slow, and stopped, in Peru, at the worship of the sun and moon, generally the first step in Heathenism. The various families separated as population increased; and although the distance between Mexico and Peru is not great, while the Peruvians navigated the Pacific, yet they were isolated from the Mexicans, and independent nations occupied the intervening lands. The gradual increase of the two great American Empires might have brought them together, but the arrival of the Spaniards prevented this collision. The recent Republic of Colombia, now subdivided into the Republics of Equador, Venezuela, and New Granada, occupied the land which once separated the Empire of Peru from the utmost southern limits of the Mexican state. This region belonged to several tribes, of whom the Muyscas were the first in civilization and power. Like the Peruvians, the Muyscas worshipped the sun and the moon; but corruption came from the North, and their creed, at the end of the fifteenth century, was far inferior to that of Peru; for its ceremonies included the sacrifice of many human victims. They had formed a regular system of Government under Princes not hereditary, but elective. Their laws were vigorously administered by an organized police. Their lands were skilfully cultivated. Their cities were large and well built, evincing considerable civilization. And the Muyscas, with their allied tribes, maintained their independence, in the recesses of the mountains, to a recent period. This independence was, indeed, fully asserted and vindicated on the Isthmus of Darien during the current year, in the presence of naval forces from England, France, and the United States, collected to survey that opening for inter-oceanic navigation, which London capitalists, in the spring of 1853, declared had been found. The investigation has been unsuccessful, as was fully anticipated in an Article in our March Number; and the result has shown, that very little confidence should have been placed in those published works of Dr. Cullen and Mr. Gisborne, which we then noticed.

Bogota is now the capital of New Granada; and the Muyscasian language is still the vernacular of the Indians in that and in other provinces of the Republic. We have already stated that the language of Spain and Portugal may yet be superseded in South America. Very few families of pure European descent now exist in the Republics of that continent; and, in the Brazilian Empire, the inhabitants are far more closely connected with Indian, than Portuguese, blood. Mr. Wallace states of the city of Barra, on the Rio Negro, that its population (only

five or six thousand) are chiefly Indians or Creoles, adding, "In fact, there is probably not a single person, born in the place, of pure European blood, so completely have the Portuguese amalgamated with the Indians." The same author, referring to the languages of the Amazon valley, says,—

"The 'Lingoa Geral' is the Tupi, an Indian language found in the country by the Jesuits, and modified and extended by them, for use among all the tribes included in their missions. It is now spread over all the interior of Brazil, and even extends into Peru and Venezuela, as well as Bolivia and Paraguay, and is the general vehicle of communication between the Brazilian traders and the Indians. It is a simple and euphonious language, and is often preferred by Europeans who get thoroughly used to it. I knew a Frenchman, who had been twenty years in the Solimaes, who always conversed with his wife and children in 'Lingoa Geral,' and could speak it with more ease than either French or Portuguese; and, in many cases, I have seen Portuguese settlers whose children were unable to speak any other language."

The "Lingoa Geral," as the name and purpose imply, is a composite dialect, taken from the various languages used in South America. They were, however, modifications of the same language, ever varying, from that want of written characters, which picture-writing could not supply; and the employment of this compound language was a retrogressive step upon a bad path, and calculated, therefore, to produce important and valuable results. At present, the Indian language is not declining in South America; and the native may yet supersede the imported dialects, unless the country fall into the possession of the Anglo-Saxon race, when, as in Hindostan, their language would become the "rising tongue."

Mexico and Yucatan do not form parts of South America. The geographical division, at the Isthmus of Darien, presents a natural landmark between the South and the North. Still the resemblance of climate, and the identity of the original races, are more powerful bonds than geographical or political arrangements. Yucatan has also other claims or attractions. It contains an unconquered population, in close proximity to British settlements. Within its territory ruins of great cities have been met with, which are altogether unexplained by any knowledge we possess of their founders and inhabitants. Mr. Fancourt was officially connected with the country for many years. His volume is preliminary to a projected work on the origin, progress, and state of the British possessions in Honduras. He has formed, from various sources, a continuous narrative of events subsequent to the discovery of Yucatan in 1508, down to 1699. The volume abounds with interesting information; and it is rendered more pleasant, from the obvious fact, that the Spanish Rulers in Yucatan appear to have been generally actuated by

purser motives, and to have acted on nobler principles, than those of other provinces. The Indians of Yucatan have never been completely conquered, and even yet maintain perpetual warfare with the European race. A few years since, the latter were in imminent danger of extermination; for the ordinary skirmishes became struggles of great magnitude, in which the Indians were, for a time, victorious. There, as in other provinces, the Indian races are disunited. A number of the tribes formed alliances with the conquerors, or were subdued, and the first reception of the Spaniards by the Yucatanese was decidedly favourable. They considered their arrival the fulfilment of a prophecy left by some of the Priesthood. They were, therefore, perfectly willing to adopt any faith proposed to them; and they were baptized in great numbers. They, however, rather wished to follow Christianity in conjunction with, than as opposed to, their Heathenism. Like all other Americans, they were unacquainted with horses. Therefore, when Cortes left his horse to gather strength in one city, after he had received some injuries, the animal was starved to death upon sweetmeats and sugars. "It had been better," adds the Spanish authority for the statement, "that he had died before he came there; for, after his death, the Cacique and his people found room for his bones in their temple, and worshipped his skeleton." They certainly believed that the horse was superior to the man.

Cortes endeavoured to improve the friendly intercourse subsisting on his arrival; but he was not supported by his followers, many of whom hasted to be rich; and thus originated a tedious war, conducted through a series of severe battles. The Indians were never thoroughly subdued; and the Ibraex, on their fortified islands in Lake Peten, and other tribes in the mountains of the interior, maintained their political independence, along with their spiritual ignorance and isolation. Upon the arrival of the Spaniards, the inhabitants of Yucatan occupied an advanced social position. They cultivated cotton, which they spun and wove, and all classes wore in tastefully-ornamented garments. They raised large crops of maize; and their savannahs supported numerous herds of cattle. They were acquainted with the sugar-cane, which formed a considerable part of their agricultural produce. Their houses were well constructed and furnished. They manufactured paper from the bark of trees, which they glued together into large sheets, with a peculiar paste. They were conversant with their native dyes, using extensively cochineal and indigo. The females spun, from cotton, gossamer threads, which they wove into remarkably fine fabrics, and then dyed or printed the cloth with designs in close imitation of nature. They were not, generally, darker than southern Europeans, especially the Ibraex, who were, as they still are, of rather fair complexion. They used hieroglyphical writing, like



that of the Mexicans; and, while their spoken language differed from that of Mexico, the distinction was probably not greater than circumstances would fully explain, without supposing a radical variance. The climate was excellent; the soil was fertile; and yet these facts do not account for the ruin of Yucatan, which must have experienced great calamities, and been in a state of decay, before a Spaniard landed on its shores.

Unsatisfactory as are all these ancient histories, from their necessarily speculative character, we turn from them to the large realities of our day; full of brilliant promise, and calling for present work. The Spanish adventurers early foresaw the advantages of the Isthmus of Darien; and, in 1519, they removed their metropolitan influence to Panama, on the Pacific. They correctly regarded New Granada as the great door of Southern America; yet, two centuries after its occupation by the Spaniards, very little progress had been made towards its settlement, because the Spanish leaders left occupants on the soil, but no inheritors of their enlarged views. In 1698, the Scotch Colony of Darien was settled there. One million of sterling money, and very many lives, were sacrificed to a selfish jealousy in London, which all now feel to have been a grand blunder. The wisdom of the scheme is completely vindicated; but to Great Britain its immense consequences are partially neutralized. New Granada remained subject to Madrid, exposed to the injustice against which the colonists of Spain long remonstrated, and finally rebelled. An unsuccessful effort was made, at the close of the last century, to form "the United States of South America;" but the promoters were arrested and executed. Miranda, a military adventurer, renewed the scheme at a subsequent date; but his followers were scattered, and he fled. When Napoleon invaded Spain, the province of Venezuela, through its Congress, renounced allegiance to the Crown of Spain, and appointed Miranda Commander-in-Chief of its forces; but this Congress renewed their submission to Rome, and refused to tolerate any other form of worship. Miranda was successful in the field, until a great earthquake destroyed many lives in 1812. The colonists considered the calamity as Heaven's judgment on their rebellion; and Montaverte, the Royalist Commander, was enabled, through this feeling, to subdue his adversary. Abandoned by a large portion of his army, Miranda was compelled to enter upon a capitulation with Montaverte. Contrary to its terms, the Venezuelan Chief was sent a prisoner to Spain, where, after four years' confinement in the dungeons of La Cabarca, he died.

Venezuela is now independent, but not at peace; for, during the past year, two armed factions struggled for supremacy. In 1853, as in 1812, a great earthquake interposed between the contending hosts. A Company of Artillery and their Captain

were literally swallowed up by the earth. Awed by the terrific calamity, the armies postponed a battle, and staggered from the beautiful, but devoted, city, subdued by a greater power than they could wield.

The New Granadians were more persevering, although originally less violent in their proceedings, than their contemporaries of Venezuela. The authority of the King was acknowledged, but the power of the Provisional Government was repudiated, at Bogota, in 1811. The Royalists attacked and defeated the Provincialists, and slew their General, Nurino, in 1814; but Bolivar assumed the chief command of New Granada in December. Soon afterwards, General Murillo landed with a large army from Spain, and in December, 1815, starved Carthagenia into submission; yet, aided by the natural strength of the country, and animated by a growing spirit of independence, the Creoles, under their celebrated leader, finally secured the political freedom of South America.

The emancipation of New Granada effected no change in its religious policy. There, in all Colombia, as in all South America, Romanism was supreme, exclusive, and intolerant; according to the Constitution of 1823, confirmed by the Constitution of Colombia in 1829. This confederacy of the three States was not permanent; and New Granada, separating from the other provinces, constructed a more liberal political constitution, but retained the supremacy of Rome. Various alterations were subsequently proposed at Bogota; and finally, in May, 1853, the existing Constitution was adopted, upon the basis of complete civil and religious freedom.

These proceedings in the Chamber of Legislation at the mountain metropolis of New Granada, have accomplished a greater revolution than Miranda contemplated, or Bolivar achieved. The military chiefs only cut leaves from the weeds of despotism, and left the old roots in a fertile soil. Weeds of the mind often resemble those of the earth, in striking deeper into the sources of their life, as the branches are cut away. The political revolutions of South America confirmed the power of the priesthood, and riveted, more firmly than before, the fetters that bound this great continent to Italian decrepitude and Roman superstition. They gave to bigotry a new licence, to intolerance fresh guarantees, and to persecution a perfect power over the minds of men. The Princes of the Vatican were ungrateful even to the Courts of Lisbon and Madrid, and blessed their rebellious opponents, while the "patriots" bowed beneath ecclesiastical despotism; but their calculations have been wrecked. Revolutions did not at once secure constitutional freedom, but they removed some of the barriers to its existence, destroyed many obstructions to international communication and commercial transactions, and thus increased the temporary immigration of many persons from Britain and the

United States; not often by example preachers of righteousness, but frequently teachers of ecclesiastical and political independence. They also inaugurated the practice of popular assemblages, and the legislators gradually acquired respect for national and personal rights.

The political features of the new Constitution are more liberal than those of the general Constitution of the Colombian Republics adopted in 1829, although the latter secured some excellent theories; for political speculations are always active among new communities. It secured more than a property qualification for representatives and senators, as it fixed the *minimum* age of the higher class at forty years. It also embraced an intellectual and moral qualification for electors. The former was to operate from and after 1840, and embraced reading and writing. The moral qualification excluded habitual drunkards; so that the temperance principle had political power in Colombia, during its infancy in Britain and the United States. Equal representation was a principle of the Colombian Constitution, which is still retained in the last edition for New Granada. The former allowed one representative for 40,000 inhabitants in a province, and one additional for every 20,000 individuals over the first number. In the latter, the number is fixed at 25,000, without any further change. The political arrangements are sufficiently liberal for any European politicians; and yet, in a country where land waits idly, not for occupants, but for owners, they will not be deemed objectionable by any parties from this country.

This new Constitution, almost unanimously adopted by the Legislature, and sanctioned by the President, offers freedom of speech, of writing, and of worship, to men of all creeds. Authors may write, and booksellers may publish, such comments, opinions, and strictures, as would be permitted in a Protestant country. The platform to the lecturer, and the pulpit to the preacher, are free and open. One man may keep a school, and another may write a newspaper, without the interference of the Parish Priest. The Bible may be circulated by Missionaries and Scripture-Readers, or sold like any other volume in the usual places of business. These privileges are conveyed in the text of the Constitution, published in the "*Gaceta Oficial*," No. 1530, at Bogota, on the 23rd of May, 1853. This document commences with the title and preamble,—“Political Constitution of New Granada: in the name of God, the Legislator of the Universe, and by the authority of the People, the Senate, and House of Representatives of New Granada, united in Congress;” and, after reciting the powers on which they act, decrees: Article V. “*La Republica garantiza a todos los Granadinos*,”—firstly, Personal Liberty; secondly, Personal Security; thirdly, the Inviolability of Property; fourthly, Liberty of Trade,—all valuable political privileges; but, fifthly, “*La Profesion libre, publica,*

*ed privada, de la Religion, que a bien tengan, contal que no turban la paz publica, no ofendan la sana moral, ni impidan a los otros el ejercicio de su culto."* This clause is sufficiently distinct in guaranteeing to all men the free, public, and private profession of their religious faith, without offending against sound morals, or impeding others in their worship; unless, indeed, at some future period a Judge should hold, that the doctrines of the Church of England, for example, are opposed to sound morals; but if society could tolerate this perversion of truth, it would be easier to expunge the law, than to modify its meaning from the Bench. The sixth clause provides immunities for any man in his own house, rendering it indeed his castle. The seventh gives Liberty to the Press, complete and perfect. The eighth secures the right of Public Meeting, "without arms," for the purpose of petitioning Congress.

The Article providing for complete religious toleration originated, we believe, in negotiations for the concession of the Atrato Canal. The promoters of that scheme demanded a guarantee, for persons settling upon their lands, from religious persecution, or even from any tax for the purposes of the Established Church. It was inserted in their concession; and then the statesmen of Bogota, anxious to promote the prosperity of their country by European immigration, learned its price. They were told that no advantages could allure a Protestant peasantry to a land where they would be precluded from establishing churches and schools after their own opinions of Divine truth. Accustomed to regard religion as a convenient observance, the New Granadian politicians met a solid wall at last. And they honoured and respected this unbending principle. They even conceded its propriety, and at some personal risk they adopted it in their new Constitution.

Senor F. Gonzalez is a vigorous friend of progress in the legislature. He was formerly Financial Minister of the Republic, subsequently a member of the Senate, and is now Attorney-General, or Public Prosecutor. We should hardly comprehend these changes in this country. A Chancellor of the Exchequer, ascending to the Upper House, and next descending to the bar, even with a silk gown, would be a political phenomenon; but, in the American Republics, public business is managed on a system at variance with our staid habits. Enlightened and useful measures have been carried by the influence of M. Gonzalez against the power of Rome. He proposed that new Constitution which we have described. He was assaulted and wounded, during a riot incited at Bogota, by his political opponents, when this Constitution was carried against the will of the Archbishop and the Pope. The schism between Church and State was widened, at that time, by the imprisonment of the Archbishop Mosquera, not on account of his Italian allegiance,

but of his disobedience to the secular power in New Granada. He has now withdrawn from the territory which he failed to subdue, and, we believe, enacts the martyr at New York, because the executive authority of the State vindicated its right to deal with clerical persons for offences against the civil law. The Archbishop was a powerful personage, being the brother of the ex-President, and imagined that he could enact the part of Thomas à Becket at Bogota, without its risks. His expectations were erroneous; and in that wherein he was defeated, it is improbable that another will ever be successful.

The crafty policy of Rome rendered the representative and republican systems subservient to its objects. So long as private judgment was controlled, and religious liberty was restrained, so long as the press was gagged, the voice of intellect and of faith silenced, so long as Protestantism was crime, and its teaching was treason, the South Americans were freely indulged with the political toys of representation, and allowed to rattle in chains the dry bones of an arid and barren liberty, under an external independence, which left them subject to Italy instead of Spain. The local representatives of the Pope protested against progress, only when the right to examine facts or theories, to propagate the results of thought on all subjects, and to legislate on all topics, without the risk of a Roman *veto*, was asserted. Then, indeed, they acted with vigour, and summoned to their aid the dupes of their teaching, until the proceedings of the legislature were obstructed by a mob, and the citizens of Bogota were compelled to secure law and order by force, which they effected without calling for military aid.

The position of New Granada towards South America invests these reforms with great importance. The territories of the Republic are divided into six portions of unequal magnitude. The Isthmus derives its influence from an obvious geographical source; but the proof now afforded, that its profitable canalization is impossible, reduces its value. The railway communication already in part established will, however, always confer immense advantages on that narrow neck of land. The canal will be made between the Atrato and the Pacific; and the water drainage of the Atrato may be considered the second division. This river and its tributaries are navigable for five hundred miles from the Gulf of Darien; and even this division is extensive, and peculiarly rich in natural resources. The land drained by the Cauca and the Magdalena, forms the third. The Cauca is a tributary of the Magdalena, and both are considered navigable to between twelve and fifteen hundred miles from the sea. The fourth division consists of lands which send their waters into the Amazon and the Orinoco; the fifth, the extremely mountainous ranges of the Cordilleras, endowed with great mineral wealth; the sixth, the long and valuable Pacific coast from Panama to the Line.



The Atrato and Isthmus divisions are isolated; and valuable, therefore, for their native position and resources alone. The fifth, or the district of the Cordilleras, will support a race of miners and hardy agriculturists, in a high temperature, who may, in a great measure, command the plains around them on every side. The division of the Cauca and the Magdalena is entirely within the territory of the Republic; and although capable of supplying tropical produce for nearly all the world at the present day, yet its importance is confined to its own resources. The Pacific coast affords abundant means of commerce and correspondence with the west coast of America, to the north and south, and therefore has an external importance, independent of its own value. Bogota, the metropolis of the Republic, is built on the river of that name, nearly at equal distances from a branch of the Orinoco and the Magdalena rivers. The city stands eight thousand feet above the level of the Atlantic, but enjoys, at this great height, an equable temperature of 60° to 70°, which, from its uniformity, permits the cultivation of plants, that would not be naturally anticipated, with this high elevation and low temperature. The sanitary position of the city is highly favourable; and a more pleasant residence than Bogota cannot be found on the American continent.

These circumstances do not bestow upon it nearly so much importance, as its geographical and geological recommendations. The former are manifest from its proximity to the Magdalena, the Orinoco, and the waters of the Rio Negro and the Amazon. It stands at the top of a net-work of navigation, through a land of tropical fertility, and three times the magnitude of the Mississippi Valley. The connexion of the Rio Negro with the Orinoco, by a perfectly navigable link, is now well known. These great rivers descend from an immense height over the ocean level, by a slightly inclined plane, on which vessels can now steam against a deep current, which was formerly overcome with great labour. Standing, therefore, in the streets of Bogota, —a city now containing 50,000 inhabitants,—the merchant, the Missionary, or the printer, is within twenty miles of the Magdalena, affording, with its large tributary, a river navigation; of two thousand miles; at nearly the same distance from the Orinoco, with again an almost equal amount of river navigation; and at sixty miles from navigable water flowing into the great Amazon, having, with its branches, water communication for quite ten thousand miles. The navigable water thus available for trading purposes, without entering the ocean, from Bogota, extends to a length of fourteen thousand miles. It is the only locality in the world having the same advantage. Now, indeed, this commanding situation is comparatively unused, but is not therefore useless. The breadth of this great land, almost unbroken in fertility,

except by rivers resembling canals, may be estimated at fifteen hundred to eighteen hundred miles, and its extreme length at nearly two thousand miles. Bogota thus stands at the north-west corner of a vast plain four times the length of Great Britain, and six times its breadth, intersected by natural canals, and teeming with all those elements of riches afforded by climate and soil. We copy a few sentences from Mr. Wallace, which incidentally confirm this view of its position:—

“I am, therefore, strongly inclined to believe that the rivers Ariari and others, rising about a hundred miles south of Bogota, are not, as shown in all our maps, the sources of the Guaviare, but of the Uaupés; and that the basin of the Amazon must, therefore, be here extended to within sixty miles of the city of Bogota. This opinion is strengthened by information obtained from the Indians of Javita, who annually ascend the Guaviare to fish in the dry season, and who state that the river is very small, and in its upper part, where some hills occur and the forest ends, it is not more than a hundred yards wide; whereas the Uaupés, at the furthest point the traders have reached, is still a large river, from a quarter of a mile to a mile in width. The Amazon and all its branches are subject, like most tropical rivers, to an annual rise and fall of very great regularity. In the main stream, and in all the branches which flow from the Andes, the waters begin to rise in December or January; when the rains generally commence, and continue rising till June, when the fine weather has just set in. The time when the waters begin to fall is about the 21st of June, seldom deviating more than a few days from this date. In branches which have their sources in a different direction,—such as the Rio Negro,—the time of rising does not coincide. On that river the rains do not commence steadily till February or March, when the river rises with very great rapidity, and generally is quite filled by June, and then begins to fall with the Amazon. It thus happens, that in the months of January and February, when the Amazon is rising rapidly, the Rio Negro is still falling in its upper part; the waters of the Amazon, therefore, flow into the mouth of the Rio Negro, causing that river to remain stagnant, like a lake, or even occasionally to flow back towards its source. The total rise of the Amazon, between high and low water-mark, has not been accurately ascertained, as it cannot be properly determined without a spirit level; it is, however, certainly not less than forty, and probably often fifty, feet. If, therefore, we consider the enormous water surface raised fifty feet annually, we shall gain from another point of view an idea of the immense quantity of water falling annually in the Amazon valley. We cannot take the length of the Amazon and its main tributaries at less than ten thousand miles, and their average width about two miles; so that there will be a surface of twenty thousand square miles of water raised fifty feet every year. But it is not only this surface that is raised; for a great extent of land on the banks of all the rivers is flooded to a great depth at every time of high water. These flooded lands are called, in the language of the country, ‘*gapo*,’ and are one of the most singular features of the Amazon. Sometimes on one side, sometimes on both, to a distance of twenty or thirty miles from the main river,

these *gapos* extend on the Amazon, and on portions of all its great branches. They are all covered with a dense virgin forest of lofty trees, whose stems are every year, during six months, from ten to forty feet under water. In this flooded forest the Indians have paths for their canoes, cutting across from one river to another, and much used to avoid the strong current of the main stream. From the mouth of the river Tapajoz to Coary, on the Solimoes, a canoe can pass without once entering the Amazon. The path lies across lakes, and among narrow inland channels, and through miles of dense flooded forest, crossing the Madeira, the Purus, and a hundred other smaller streams. All along, from the mouth of the Rio Negro to the mouth of the Iça, is an immense extent of *gapo*, and it reaches also far up into the interior; for even near the sources of the Rio Negro, and on the upper waters of the Uaupés, are extensive tracts of land, which are usually overflowed."

When land becomes valuable, the *gapos* will be superseded, and the water which occupies them now will be retained in tanks, as in India, for irrigation or navigation. The former is not, indeed, absolutely requisite on the Amazon valley, as rains fall with nearly European regularity.

The geological riches of Bogota will increase the value of its situation. It is in the proximity of salt mines which may be considered inexhaustible. Copper ores abound in the mountains around the city: and evidence has been afforded that the coal mines will yet supply the furnaces of all the steamers on the many thousand miles of water flowing into it. The valley of the Orinoco contains a small number of inhabitants. The population of the Amazon is still smaller, in proportion to the magnitude of the land. But on both rivers a greater number of persons live and die than we are in this country accustomed to believe. The upper waters of the Amazon and its tributaries are possessed by thoroughly independent Indians, living still in utter Heathenism. They offer no insuperable obstacle to intercourse and instruction. The traveller experiences from them no inhospitable welcome: he enters, and hangs his hammock in their lodges, for their villages are under one roof. Even the *Lingoa Geral* fails him in some quarters; and the language of barter and commerce is the only means of intercourse. The natives exist in these upper districts in a very peculiar state. They manufacture baskets and various ornaments, without metals, with great ingenuity and perseverance. They abundantly provide for their own wants and those of their families, in ordinary circumstances; and yet, as ever was and always will be true, those dark places of the earth are the abodes of horrid cruelty. The *Pages*, or "Heathen Priests," inculcate the observance of ceremonies attended with extreme pain. The males indulge in a particular music, so fatal to females, that if a woman unfortunately, by accident, sees the instrument, she dies. A malevolent Indian gentleman, by merely producing this

instrument of what the Roman Catholic Indians style "the music of the Evil Spirit," in a company of native females, would subject all of them to capital punishment. The mind can hardly imagine the existence of society under customs so absurdly cruel and unjust. Cannibalism is practised among some of the tribes, not from necessity,—for the rivers teem with fish, and the land with fruits,—but as a matter of taste. The Indians eat every thing. If the alligators attack them, they also consume the alligators. If the jaguars seize and tear them for breakfast, they enjoy extremely a steak from this western tiger, when it can be procured. The abundance of animal and vegetable food leaves them no reason, on the ground of want, for consuming the bodies of their enemies; but some of them prefer their friends, while others examine the question entirely with reference to the condition of the subject. They are not poor, because poverty is incompatible with their position: they are not rich, because they have few ideas of improving their circumstances. They are not intelligent; for they are bound on all sides by a chain of divinations, sorceries, omens, and incantations; and yet they exhibit great ingenuity in the ordinary business of life, and, in their position, with the exceptions already stated, considerable regard for its social duties. Their numbers cannot rapidly increase, from the peculiar organization of society among them, and from other causes,—their frequent neglect of their children,—but chiefly those frightful observances which form their only worship, directed, as they confess, to "the Evil One," and therefore evil in their character and results.

We acknowledge the improvement presented by the Indians and the Negroes under the influence of the Roman Catholic Priests on the lower banks of the river. They are less brutal and savage in their worship, more careful and world-like in their lives; but they are utterly destitute of religious knowledge, and they have few intellectual attainments.

The Peruvians have offered very liberal terms to European settlers on the upper banks of the Amazon. The country, according to Mr. Wallace, is comparatively healthy. The obstacles to farming are very few, and easily met: the soil is extremely rich, and labour is inexpensive. At present the lower banks of the rivers present one vast mass of forest; offering timber in quantities that scarcely can be exaggerated, of far higher quality than the American pines of the north, and not at a higher price. The freight from the mouth of the Magdalena, the Orinoco, or the Amazon, cannot be much higher than that from the St. Lawrence; and the difference should be met by a reduction in the cost of floating to ports of shipment; while, for the pines of the north, we could readily command the cedars of the south. The British Empire comprehends part of the coast between the Orinoco and the Amazon. British Guiana extends from the

southern mouth of the Orinoco to the frontiers of Dutch Guiana, and recedes for a distance, not well defined, towards the centre of the country. Guiana possesses a distinctive water-shed, independent of either of the two great rivers that we have named, and of such magnitude, that, ultimately, it may be made a convenient frontier towards Venezuela.

The physical resources of New Granada were described by General Mosquera, in a pamphlet which has been translated and re-published at New York. Mosquera, who died recently, was President of the Republic, but retired in 1849, and was succeeded by General Lopez, who, at the expiration of three years, was followed by General Jose Maria Obando, the present President. Mosquera thus possessed ample opportunities of collecting information regarding the country; and his pamphlet resembles an official report, without any apparent exaggeration. The writer had imbibed the native Americanism of New York, which is certainly not current at Bogota. In a map attached to his pamphlet, Mosquera designates the British Colony which we have described, "a usurpation of the English," although we have all the right to the banks of the Demerara and the Essequibo that he and his fellow-countrymen can show to those of the Atrato and the Magdalena; or his northern friends, to the lands upon the Hudson. We are all usurpers in a narrow sense, and the English have been the most harmless usurpers in South America; for our present policy is confined to efforts for the preservation of an independent Indian nation, north of the Isthmus; and our relations with the Indians in our territories, south of the Atrato, have always been amicable in their nature. Mosquera might have remembered, that Canning brought the South American Colonies into existence; and that, if the independence of New Granada be hereafter threatened, its people have more reason to expect aid from England than from any other power. We dislike this exhibition of enmity to England, because we do not find the usurpation of Holland or of France on the map, although they are our "next neighbours" in Guiana; but Mosquera's opinions are not entertained by his countrymen.

The pamphlet is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of a country which occupies so commanding a position. The irregular configuration of its territories, and the fact that they are not yet fully explored, render a precise statement of their arable contents now impossible; but their limits are equal to those of France, Belgium, and Holland; and if the contemplated re-union with the Equador and Venezuela were completed, the Peninsula might be thrown into the estimate.

The objections existing to its European colonization are strictly material; for the emigrant may be at once admitted into all the rights of citizenship. He will not become respon-



sible, as in the States, for the existence of slavery. He cannot be required to enforce a fugitive-slave law; for none exists. New Granada has now no slaves. All distinctions of caste, colour, or creed are abolished.

The majority of its inhabitants are Creoles, who partake more of Muyscasian than Spanish blood. The Normans in England, being of the same race with the Saxons, were rapidly absorbed in the native population. The Spaniards and the Indians were of different races, and the absorption of the former has not been rapid, although it progresses; but a large immigration of Europeans would change the current. The morals of the population contrast favourably with those of any other South American State. Valuable parcels of gold are habitually transmitted by mail, without an escort or a robbery. Crimes attended with violence are extremely rare; for those committed on the Isthmus cannot be ascribed to New Granadians. The revolutionary armies were disbanded without the formation of banditti similar to those which afflict Mexico; and we read of no gangs living by robbery, as in the Northern Republic. The temptations to dishonesty are certainly small in a land where existence is easily supported, and even riches may be readily procured.

The standing army of New Granada, during peace, is smaller than that of any similar country. It is not larger in proportion to the population than that of the United States, with their greater enlightenment, and a much more defensible frontier; for the Southern Republic, without a navy, is exposed on two sides of its triangle to oceans. A legislative enactment of the 22nd of May, 1852, gives the number of the army, during peace, at eighteen hundred men. The inhabitants of New Granada are taken at two and a half millions, and may, therefore, be one half million under the present population of Scotland, which has a smaller military force than any European country, but not smaller than this Republic. The military of France, taking population into account, exceeds that of New Granada by sixteen to one, Belgium by twenty-five to one, and Britain by five to one, without reckoning our naval service, or our Indian army, and the native forces in our Colonies. Our Indian army is a powerful force; but, upon the basis of population, is not so numerous as several European armies. During intestine troubles, the New Granadian army may be raised to twenty-five thousand, and during foreign war to one hundred thousand, men.

These military and other details oppose our statement, that society in the South American cities exists on a lower moral level than in European towns. It is difficult to support the statement, from the particularly low level in many countries of this continent; and while the circumstances of New Granada

have favoured the growth of superstition, yet, in Bogota and other towns, liberal principles have acquired an ascendancy on those topics, in which the love of change is moral progress.

Mr. Wallace states, however, of Barra, the first town on the Rio Negro and in the Brazils:—

“Morals are, perhaps, at the lowest ebb possible in any civilized community; you will every day hear things commonly talked of, about the most respectable families in the place, which would hardly be credited of the inhabitants of the worst parts of St. Giles's.”

He was detained at Guia, on the Rio Negro, waiting for a Priest, who was making a baptismal tour; and his Indians would not move on until the arrival of the *Padre*.

“At length, however, he arrived, a tall, thin, prematurely old man, thoroughly worn out by every kind of debauchery, his hands crippled, and his body ulcerated; yet he still delighted in recounting the feats of his youth. He had been a soldier, then a Friar in a convent, and afterwards a parish Priest. He told tales of his convent life, just like what we read in Chaucer of their doings in his time. Don Juan was an innocent compared with Frei Joze.”

The *Padre* had a shilling for each baptism, and the author says, that the processes “bore sufficient resemblance to the complicated operations of their own *Pagès*, [‘Conjurors,’] to make the Indians think they had got something very good in return for their money.”

The debauched condition of common life in South American cities is universally admitted; and circumstances in the villages and rural districts preclude the hope, that greater innocence or less guilt is to be found in them. We have reason to suppose, that New Granada is not worse, and probably is better, than other States; yet the prevalent vices, although extremely degrading, in the lands south of its borders, do not include danger to the person or the property of those who take no part in the prevalent corruption.

The sanitary character of the climate is superior to that of any other tropical land. The ocean breezes, the stupendous sierras, forming three inland ranges, and an independent group on the north-eastern corner of the Republic, neutralize the tropical heat. The fevers of the valleys do not ascend many hundred feet above the tidal level. Poisonous insects and reptiles are unknown at a height of two thousand feet; but wheat-growing lands commence at three thousand, and continue to nine thousand, feet above the ocean. The local fevers of the valleys originate in causes which industry and population will remove. Accidents from poisonous or wild animals are few, and will annually become fewer. The census at various dates vindicates the sanitary character of the climate, since hitherto immigration has not swelled its figures. The population was, in 1820, 1,437,000;

in 1827, 1,357,000; in 1834, 1,687,000; in 1852, 2,351,000. The decrease in the first septennial period may be ascribed to the civil wars, and the banishment or the withdrawal of many royalist families. From 1827 to 1852, twenty-six years, the increase is 1,000,000, or 80 *per cent.*, being three times the increase of Great Britain and Ireland, without, however, reckoning the immigration from this country; while the census of New Granada may have been more accurately taken in 1852 than in 1827.

Labour is the grand want of the country; and we infer that the population are not distinguished by energy or industry. An official report, on the resources and state of various provinces, contains a bitter complaint against auriferous sands in rivers. The reporter charges the peasantry of Choco with indolence, from, he says, "the facilities they possess of obtaining wealth." A peasant who has to pay an account, or to make a purchase, walks to the banks of the Atrato, or of one of its tributaries, and washes the sand until he finds a sufficient quantity of gold-dust to dismiss his creditors, or to supply his wants. The same process, continued for a short time, would make him a freeholder of a parish; but a few days' labour annually provides an abundance of vegetables for his family, and he hunts in the forests or the mountains for venison. This pleasant life has its drawbacks. The man, while looking for his money in the sand of the rivers, may be seized by an alligator, stung by a scorpion, bitten by a viper, twisted into food for a boa-constrictor, or torn into shape for a jaguar's dinner. Centipedes may crawl over him in any direction; ants of enormous dimensions may threaten to appropriate parts of the gold-hunter to the objects of their community; mosquitoes may assail him mercilessly; and half a million of indescribable flies may darken the atmosphere around him; for the valleys of New Granada swarm with insect and reptile life; but even minute animal torments are beaten and disappear, in the tropics, before population.

New Granada presents attractions, and also objections, to European settlers. The latter are not greater than those of tropical countries in general, and smaller, or more easily overcome, than the obstructions in our path in other lands. The mountains are volcanic, and the valleys are occasionally shaken by earthquakes. Powerful foes of man swarm in the rivers; but men will finally extirpate even the alligator and the crocodile. Daring and wild animals exist in the forests; but, in the progress of population, they will be destroyed. Serpents, of all descriptions, haunt the low grounds; but the Indians and the Negroes have an antidote to their poison. The yellow fever seems indigenous to the river-banks and the sea-coast, although it is not nearly so destructive as the plague and the sweating-sickness were once in England; and they have ceased in our

land. But all these drawbacks and encumbrances are unknown in those comparatively elevated regions, where alone Europeans should settle to cultivate the soil.

The attractions of New Granada are not easily enumerated; for they embrace all the productions common to temperate and tropical regions. Gold has been hitherto exported chiefly in the form of "dust;" but large nuggets have been found. The annual production of the Viceroyalty was once estimated at nearly £700,000. The yield of the same ground is now larger. A single copy of a chart of Antioquia, one of the provinces, exists, "*Par Jose Manuel Restrepo, 1819,*" and rectified by A. Leleaux, Colonel of Engineers in the service of Colombia, in 1823. If it were lithographed and published, it would re-animate the stock-jobbing world; for it is dotted over with yellow spots, designating gold-findings. We reckoned over three hundred of these auriferous corners, and left off, wearied with the work, in regret that gold, so plentiful in some quarters, should be so rare in Britain, and even be made the object of idolatry.

We have a manuscript copy of a report on the gold and mining resources of Choco,—that province of New Granada intersected by the Atrato and its tributaries,—which was drawn up on the spot by Mr. Halsey, an English engineer, employed, in 1851, on this service. He died in the country, or on his return; and the document, fortunately for Australia, has not been published; for it reveals the existence of fabulous wealth within twenty-four days' direct steaming of our ports.

Gold, in our opinion, is a secondary or a tertiary object; and we shall only take a few extracts from this curious document, which is confined to the upper banks of the Atrato, and one of its tributaries. Mr. Halsey says, that the deepest shaft he saw was three feet high, and forty to fifty feet long, into the face of the rock; from which a Negro and his children had taken twenty-five pounds of gold, which, at £50, the value in the country, was worth £1,250. They were afraid to dig further, and stopped there. A single bowl of ore from these rock veins, he adds, frequently yields one pound of gold. Black sand and gravel he considers the surest material to work upon; but as the researches of the miners have never extended more than three hundred yards from the river's banks, nothing is known of the interior. Stamps and steam-engines are unnecessary to wash out the black sand, which forms, for hundreds of miles, a prevalent element in the river's deposits. But in the mountains, between the Andagueda and the Cauca, numerous mines have been appropriated, and have been partially wrought. The largest lump of gold yet discovered, weighed fifteen pounds. One person collected one pound and a half of gold dust in a single day, of which the value was £75. No failure having ever occurred on the Andagueda, the inference is, that the rock veins of gold

form a regular *stratum*, extending to many hundred miles. The deposits are quite open to two or three able-bodied labourers in company. Provisions are cheap; and they can be increased without an approachable limit. The climate is healthy, and the mosquitoes do not extend to the upper parts of the river; but the direct navigation by steamers can be effected for 400 to 500 miles, when the river is high, and 350 at any season. We refer to navigation by first-class steamers. The country abounds in platina and silver mines, perhaps more valuable than those of gold. We have not copied some statements from this report, because, if they are true, the facts would revolutionize our present standards of value. They form romances of gold, or "Arabian Nights'" tales of geology. But, at this point, although unconnected with the province of Choco, we may add that, on the upper bank of the Amazon, in 1853, several diggers had gained twenty-five pounds of gold for each person, by the labour of a few weeks.

In another province of New Granada six thousand four hundred pounds of gold dust passed through the Post Office within a comparatively short period. Its value, at £50 per pound, was £320,000. Many silver mines are wrought within the Republic. Mines of cinnabar, probably more important than the auriferous deposits, have been found in Antioquia, in Santa Rosa, and in the mountain of Quindiu. Platina was first discovered in Choco; and its value, for chemical purposes, is highly appreciated. The salt of New Granada is unusually pure; and the mines are sufficient to supply South America for ages to come. Coals have been procured, in the province of Bogota, eight thousand feet above the level of the Pacific. Copper ore is wrought for all home consumption, and will yet form an article of export. Iron-stone exists in the mountains, and, after the development of coal mines, will be extremely profitable. The emeralds of Peru are proverbial, and yet entirely fictitious. Emeralds have never yet been found in Peru. The emerald mine is fifty miles from Bogota; and it supplies all these precious stones. This unique rock is the only quarry of emeralds in the world. The dust of the land is literally gold; and among its stones are diamonds, amethysts, and jacinths.

The policy of Spain retarded the prosperity of her Colonies. The vine was a forbidden plant in New Granada. The mulberry tree was neglected; but, as population increases, they will produce silk for their own markets, and those of other nations. The olive and the palm grow in the forests to the level of Bogota. Far above them, stately oaks adorn the mountain brows. The sugar-cane is extensively cultivated, although its produce is chiefly consumed at home. The coffee plant thrives. The cotton bushes grow luxuriantly. Indigo has long formed a staple of Colombia. The cochineal insects are produced in great



numbers. The anti-febrile tree, which furnishes the celebrated Peruvian bark, forms forests exclusively of its species. A scattered population never engage largely in an export trade, with the exception of Anglo-Saxon colonists; but New Granada has long supplied our markets with valuable dyes; and her forests would freight the navies of the world with the most precious woods. The yield of barley, maize, and wheat, in their respective regions, ranges from an increase of eighteen to thirty; but the farms are not cultivated with the rural skill of East Lothian.

No other territory combines more advantages. Its grateful soil is intersected by immense rivers and innumerable streams; so that, beneath a tropical sun, its plains are covered with perpetual verdure. The highly-prized flowers of British gardens are the wild weeds on its hill sides. Flowers and fruit mingle together on the same bough. Majestic trees, covered with foliage, throw around them the richest odours. The balsamic trees are extremely numerous. The ground beneath them teems with medicinal plants; and fragrant lilies stretch upwards in astonishing profusion. The intense heat of the tropics is mitigated by the vicinity of two great oceans, by the multitude of streams and rivers, by the vast height of the mountains, and the snow on their summits continually pouring iced waters over the plains, and cooling the atmosphere. The timber—in vale, or hill, or mountain—comprises dye-woods equal to any in the world; mahogany, unsurpassed in richness of grain; cedars, like those of Lebanon; ebony, unrivalled in hardness; the *muro*, unequalled in varied shades; the *chicaranda*, possessing a capacity for the highest polish; the olive and the palm, producing the oils of commerce which our manufacturers have never obtained in adequate quantities: and thus the clearance of land, where so many waters are navigable, is a source of profit, instead of outlay. New Granada is destined to give influential aid in the struggle between free and slave-grown productions; for the soil is no longer cursed by slavery. The land languishes for labourers, whom it would raise into freeholders. Ere the present century draws to its close, new villages will be formed on its table-lands; innumerable vessels will navigate its now almost unknown waters; a vast population will be collected on its terraced mountains; and with us partly rests the formation of their character: for, upon its flowery plains, amid its palm and olive groves, beside its deep, still rivers, within its future cities, a race may rise to guard the independence of that mountain-land, to nourish freedom in South America; and, from intellectual and softened hearts, the thoughts and words of praise and prayer may flow in grateful adoration.

The river-navigation forms another advantage to European immigrants; for it carries them onwards and upwards until they have gained an altitude above the ocean, equal to that of the

highest habitations on the Alpine range, and have found on table-lands, spreading into provinces, a congenial climate and a fertile soil. From these high grounds the descendants of European settlers may direct opinion in the almost boundless plains beneath them ; for the Andes and their table-lands will govern South America, as the Himalayas and their corresponding districts will govern India, although their influence need not, and probably will not, be based upon physical force, but on mental culture and moral power. This peculiarity indicates the importance of establishing, in the territories of the Republic, settlements of European Protestants, with their churches, schools, printing-presses, and other means of vindicating truth and pure religion, among a people unaccustomed to the alliance between religious faith and personal purity, or to consider high-toned morals as connected with religious opinion, dependent on religious sentiments, or flowing from spiritual influences.

Merchants and speculators in search of investments, and ship-owners desirous to shorten long voyages, have recently inquired into all the peculiarities of Panama and Choco. They have sent surveyors to examine the botanical, geographical, and geological characteristics of the country. Estimates have been drawn up for its canalization. Plans have been devised to drain the rich delta of the Atrato. Schemes have been proposed for the colonization of the country, which, ere many years pass away, will contribute to feed the spindles of Cheshire and Lancashire with free-grown and stainless cotton. The commercial interests evince some activity ; but the religious world is apathetic on this subject. The former have proposed to adopt the opportunities, but the latter have almost entirely neglected the suggestions, afforded to them by the recent legislation at Bogota. The spiritual regeneration of South America has to be effected ; and where a commencement of reform might be made, we cannot take possession of the ground. We might now circulate moral and religious tracts ; and the intellectual men, who have carried the new Constitution, desire assistance of that nature. They probably seek more eagerly for secular science than spiritual truths ; but the former may be imbued with the latter. The disciples of our Protestant faith are bound to seek its propagation. Missions form an essential part of their duty, and are so requisite to its vitality, that faith without them is almost "dead also."

London, notwithstanding its multitudes of reckless men, is yet, doubtless, the metropolis of Protestantism ; and there, in May, 1853, were assembled many of its devoted disciples, planning means to occupy mission-fields, and supplicating for their enlargement. The answers to their prayers were given in the east and the west, at Nankin and Bogota. China and South America, opened in one month, added greatly to our respon-

sibilities. With the exception of British Guiana, the whole of South America was previously closed against Protestantism. The land of the most gigantic operations in nature, calculated to support one-half of all the inhabitants now on the earth, almost abandoned to the insect and reptile world, had, and has, little intellectual life, and *that* little is clouded by superstition, absolutely less philosophical than the errors which it supplanted in Peru, when its Incas, their golden temples of the sun, and silvery gardens of the moon, were overthrown.

We do not propose to take advantage of the new Constitution of Granada to establish Missions alone to any party; for that course might embarrass the Legislature and the Executive: but their offer of freedom and land to all Christian immigrants presents a noble opportunity to attack slavery in its stronghold,—the cotton trade of the United States,—and, by the example of a pure faith and biblical principles actuating a prosperous community, to draw the population of the Republic gradually into a consideration of those claims, which the religion they nominally profess has upon their hearts and life.

The country forms a grand strategical point in that moral warfare which pure Christianity must direct against its avowed and disguised opponents. Hindostan contains one hundred and fifty millions of persons; but its limits are not nearly equal to those great regions of South America which may be reached from Bogota, and its immediate environs, by river carriage alone. Even now it is the best centre for a Mission to the Pagan Indians on the upper banks of the great waters, that could be selected. The land forms at once the gate and garrison of two-thirds of South America; and if we neglect to seize a share of its influences now, hereafter our successors may remember this apathy with sorrow. Our own island of Trinidad, opposite the Orinoco, secures, indeed, a part of those advantages which the inland navigation affords, but is obviously unequal to Bogota, as a central point of operation.

The wide valley of Hindostan, the great extent of China, those profoundly-interesting regions of Asiatic Turkey, the fatherland, twice in our history, of the human race, the modern martyr-isle of Madagascar, the continent of Africa, all claiming aid, all promising ample returns, may well distract the efforts of British Christians; but they have prayed for these movements, and they must meet them, now that the answers to many prayers have been obtained, exactly as they were presented: yet, amid all the demands of the Old World, and its dying myriads, the new strange voice from the West, that, like the Macedonian's, says, "Come over and help us," will not, we trust, be overpowered and forgotten.

## BRIEF LITERARY NOTICES.

---

Speeches of the Right Honourable T. B. Macaulay, M.P. Corrected by Himself. Longman and Co. 1854.

THE Speeches of Mr. Macaulay will be welcome, and even popular. If they do not positively increase his oratorical reputation, which it would be very absurd to expect, they will both sustain and extend it; and that is more than publication would achieve for far more eloquent contemporaries. This may be thought a very questionable proof of his success in the art of public speaking; but, at the same time, a doubt may be suggested, whether it is not possible to rise above the usual limits of a popular and capricious art, and lose some of its temporary rewards in the attempt to refine and dignify its character.

Oratory of the most effective kind is transitory from its very nature, and defies perpetuation. Even the noblest and highest specimens of eloquence form no exception to this natural law; but, perhaps, serve only to bring it into notice. The greatest orators of antiquity ground all their fame on our historical belief; the authority of their genius rests mainly on tradition. The name of Demosthenes has become a synonyme of eloquence, and summons to our mind an image of commanding power; yet the mere reader of his remaining Speeches could never have attained the conviction, or even the suspicion, of their reputed popular effects. It is certain that the orations of Demosthenes, prepared though they evidently are with consummate art, and inspired by the profoundest genius, would totally fail, not only in arousing the mind of the modern public, but of conveying to the accomplished reader any overwhelming impression of their original influence and power. Of course it may be said, in explanation of this fact, that the delivery of the speaker is wanting, and the circumstances of the audience vastly different; that the style of the popular appeal varies yet more widely than the matter; that oratory is an art adapting itself in all ages to the genius of the people; that it is intellectual or passionate, a chain of reasoning, or an electric flash of sympathy, according as the assembly addressed is more or less refined, and accustomed to weigh the justice, or presume the goodness, of its cause. All this is true; but the truth most clearly deducible is this,—that the subservient character of popular eloquence is fatal to its high pretensions as an art. What is so partial and ephemeral in itself, and often most eminent in its success where it is least competent to gratify the ear of judgment or of taste, can seldom rise above the class of gross

expedients. From its slavish nature, its ignoble artifices, and its almost inevitable abuses, the art of eloquence must always range lower than the other arts of imagination, which have truth for their substance, and perpetual praise for their reward.

It is in striking proof of the narrowing limits of oratorical power, that the highest deliberative assemblies, in this advanced age of the world, are so little subject to its influence. In the British House of Commons it has ever met with admiration and applause; but the orator who shall carry half-a-dozen votes from the opposite benches is, perhaps, yet unrisen. This does not, indeed, always or necessarily detract from the genius of the author; for the failure of the highest eloquence, of reason and passion interfused, is often due to the prejudice and predetermination of the hearers, to the counter-influence of party-feeling, to the want of candour, disinterestedness, or moral courage. Yet this only the more plainly shows the slavish nature of this imposing art. The orator must follow further than he leads; to improve in much, he must pander to far more. If he nobly dispenses with these unworthy compromises, and aims to lead his audience by candid statements and legitimate appeals, he is doomed to lose his labour. Such a man is not necessarily below the requirements of his art; it is quite as probable that he is above them. The eloquence of Burke was only the less effective because he was too far above his audience and before his age, and to him posterity will listen with increasing approbation; for future generations are the true contemporaries of such a man.

It must be remembered, however, that the orator's defeat is frequently due to something far nobler than prejudice and party-feeling. The diffusion of a high intelligence in such an assembly as the House of Commons, and the power of moral judgment residing, for the most part, safely in all majorities of such assemblies, are principal elements in this species of passive resistance, which is thus fortunately proof, not merely against appeals of coarser character, but against the subtle sophistries which too frequently pervade the higher efforts of impassioned reason. The fallacy which is not easily detected or exposed by any one, is commonly felt and resisted by the most admiring audience.

The Parliamentary career of Mr. Macaulay affords a double illustration of these truths. With all his powers of eloquence, in which the closest argument is seconded by the most powerful rhetoric, he has never proved very influential in the House of Commons. The truth seems to be, that, in questions of pure policy, this failure is mainly due to the deficient candour of his audience; but frequently, when a profounder principle is involved, he is rightly resisted by the moral judgment of the many. No one can read these Speeches without feeling increased admiration for the genius of the accomplished orator. They are remarkable for clear, sustained, and cumulative argument; rich in historical allusion; simple and dignified in their appeals; almost perfect in their command and discipline of language. There does not seem to be a thought or word superfluous, not a diffuse sentence, nor an incongruous idea. An opinion is entertained, we believe, by many, that something factitious, if not absolutely meretricious, disfigures the set speeches of Mr. Macaulay. This volume, at least, does not bear out that view. There is far less questionable



rhetoric here than in many of his brilliant Essays. Yet the impression made upon the reader's mind is not wholly satisfactory. The intellect is fatigued by his elaborate and well-balanced periods, while the heart is not sufficiently refreshed. The something wanting consists, we think, in the absence of a moral earnestness, the total lack of enthusiasm; the sense of weariness arises from the constant and complete predominance of the intellectual faculties. Mr. Macaulay brings unusual powers to do the work of a partisan. Even when his reasoning is most conclusive, his sincerity is not so warm as to attract you to his person; for judgment, and not sympathy, compels your suffrage. The slave of his imperious intellect, you perhaps welcome an occasion for rebellion and dissent.

As an example of Mr. Macaulay's misplaced ingenuity, we may instance his speech on the Sugar Duties, in February, 1845. It was pronounced in favour of an Amendment proposed, in a Committee of Ways and Means, by Lord John Russell; which Amendment declared the continuance of the differential duties on slave-grown sugar to be "impracticable and illusory." On merely economical principles, it was admitted on both sides, no distinction could be maintained; but it was rightly argued by Sir Robert Peel's Government, that, considering how clearly this country had expressed itself for the abolition of slavery, what sacrifices it had already made, and what active and expensive measures it still employed, to that end, a departure from the strict rule of commercial polity would only be sacrificing a much lower to a much higher order of consistency; while, to countenance the hideous slave-trade for so paltry an advantage, would be to prefer expediency in the smallest, to principle in its most important, form. It is melancholy to see how Mr. Macaulay brightens his arms and fortifies his position to assail this argument and maintain the contrary. He sets up, forsooth, an imaginary wall, enjoining perfect justice and active consistence; and because it is impracticable to conform to such a standard, and our markets cannot be kept wholly free from slave-production in one shape or other, we must, therefore, distinctly avow and countenance it in its most abhorrent form.

With this and one or two kindred exceptions, we have been much pleased with the speeches contained in the present volume: they contain a larger amount of political wisdom than we looked to find. Perhaps the most valuable are those on Parliamentary Reform. Mr. Macaulay will doubtless be mentioned in the political history of our times as one of the ablest advocates of the progressive measures which have so eminently distinguished it. Not greatly influential in his day, nor popularly quoted at the club or tavern, he is destined to be a living authority, when most of his more powerful contemporaries are represented only by a name. Acknowledged at the present as a man of letters among statesmen, he will one day be known as a statesman among men of letters. Almost all that has been said for parliamentary and commercial reform, is summed up in the able arguments and nervous language of our orator. The Speeches most interesting to the general reader are, that on "Copyright," and some of the miscellaneous addresses. In them the boundless information and graphic powers of Mr. Macaulay are freely drawn upon and exercised; and if the amount of literary and historic lore at his command is quite

unrivalled, still rarer is his masterly and tasteful use of it. In conclusion, we cannot regret that Mr. Macaulay has been almost forced into the publication of his volume. The bookseller whose act of appropriation has irritated him into this transaction, has really done our senator good service in compelling him to do it for himself; and we must remember, moreover, in justice to Mr. Vizetelly, who incurs so large a measure of the author's indignation, that he is not to be regarded as a lawless pirate, but a privateer sailing under letters of marque. Mr. Macaulay's reputation might have been taken at a greater disadvantage, if the buccaneers had delayed to fight for it till he could no longer make his own defence, or, at the worst, set his good ship in order, fling out his real colours, and make it a prize worth taking into any port, whether of the distant or the future.

**The Sensibility of Separate Souls considered.** By Caleb Webb. London, 1854.

WE know not any arguments tending to disprove the sensibility of the human soul in its separate state, which do not involve dangerous, and even fatal, concessions to the debasing doctrine of Materialism. Those who contend that the soul *does* not after death exist in independent consciousness, do so on grounds which equally avail to show that it *cannot* so exist. On the other hand, there is nothing which assures us of the immateriality of the soul, which does not also guarantee both its power of separate consciousness, and its attribute of uninterrupted being. Take, for example, an argument from the nature of identity. Identity is not common to all animal existences in their individual state, but proper only to man; for true personality consists in that moral principle which underlies all the experiences, and is present through all the changes, to which the human individual is exposed. Man "possesses a sense of permanence in connexion with a sense of change;" and this sense of permanence it is that distinguishes him from the brute, which has only a succession of sensations, and no consciousness or central principle of unity. We arrive, then, at the great truth, that consciousness is essential to the being of man; that it is not, like animal existence, necessarily interrupted by the disintegration of the bodily frame, because there is no proof that it is really dependent on it; and (as Bishop Butler argues) there is nothing in the known character of death which is antagonistic or destructive to this spiritual, thinking, and conscious principle of being. Thus much may be said, even to the sceptic, on behalf both of the immortality and uninterrupted sensibility of the soul; but the Christian, who doubts not the former, but wants assurance of the latter state, may learn to infer the one from the other, even on philosophical principles; for if (as he believes) the soul is indeed independent of the body, and survives when this is wholly dissolved, and the marvellous brain is no longer to be distinguished from the vilest dust, the soul must continue indiscernible, and exercise at least that consciousness which is characteristic of its nature, inseparable even from the notion of identity, and necessary to the conservation of its uninterrupted being.

But the Christian is not left, in a point of so much personal interest, to a dependence on his own reason. That kind of assurance with which worldly moralists profess to be quite satisfied, is for him

only secondary and corroborative. Philosophy, so far as it goes, is entirely favourable to his pious wish; but only revelation can afford him perfect confidence; and this he is not left without. He who declared himself to be "the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob," has condescended to make the additional declaration, that "he is not the God of the dead, but of the living;" as though he would urge upon our minds the consoling inference, itself the direct assertion of another scripture, that "to be absent from the body" is, in the case of all his saints, to be immediately "present with the Lord."

Mr. Webb's little volume is worthy of perusal. In the first part, he considers the general argument; and, in the second, offers some remarks upon a number of passages in the New Testament, in each of which he finds the consciousness of the intermediate state to be more or less distinctly asserted or implied. To the whole of his textual elucidations we could not subscribe. Some, as we think, are palpably erroneous; others are strained to the author's purpose. The scriptural argument is not, we conceive, done vigorous and substantial justice to. Perhaps a more accurate and extensive critical knowledge would have served him better. But we are happy to commend this thoughtful effort as in the main correct, and evincing no small amount of evangelical feeling and discernment.

**Discovery: a Poem.** By Edward Aldam Leatham, M.A.  
London: Walton and Maberly. 1853.

If published a century ago, this graceful poem would have justly brought reputation to its author; at the present time it will be as justly left to the partial admiration of his friends. Such productions mark the high cultivation of the age, but do not greatly distinguish the individual. It is in art, as in other spheres of mental action: originality alone shows eminent power, and the excellence of a work is no certain indication of the author's genius. Many a mariner now pushes his keel beyond Hispaniola, and even "grates the golden isles" of the Pacific; but the merit of Columbus is not so readily out-matched; for it is almost as easy to follow in his wake as to set his celebrated egg in upright posture. If we could forget the poems of Rogers and Campbell, the verses of Mr. Leatham would have for us the charm of novelty as well as beauty, and we should hail the advent of a real poet. As it is, however, we have pleasure in transcribing the following lines, which are creditable to their author's taste and skill,—

"Then Commerce learn'd in triumph to expand  
Her snowy wings upon the bustling strand,  
And, like a prisoned bird from durance free,  
Rode every blast, and tempted every sea;  
Nor roam'd alone, for Plenty soar'd behind,  
And shook her golden lap for all mankind,  
Piled with those orient spoils and gems that shine,  
Like stars unrisen, in Golconda's mine,  
Or spice that breathes upon the balmy rest  
Of fragrant Ind, and Araby the blest.  
But brighter gems the bounteous goddess bore,  
And sweeter frankincense from shore to shore,—  
The scents that breathe Idalian groves among,  
And all the priceless jewelry of song."

The Ballad of Babe Christabel: with other Lyrical Poems. By Gerald Massey. Third Edition. Bogue. 1854.

THE poetry of Gerald Massey is of a very different stamp from the preceding. It is all instinct with individual power, and much of it is strongly tinctured with popular and current tendencies. While only one of these qualities is the source of unmixed pleasure to the reader, they have both conspired to give the author an unusual popularity. In this improved edition of his Poems, Mr. Massey has thought fit to retain the democratic songs which first attracted to him the public notice; but he seems to be aware that they are not able to fix or to reward it. He intimates, in the very interesting Preface now first published, that they are valuable only as "the out-come of a marked and peculiar experience," and were intended to be "read in the light or gloom of that experience," as recorded in the brief Memoir affixed. Certainly, those political pieces, however spirited, and stirring with a truly fanatic *animus*, are everyway inferior and unworthy; while the love-poetry of Mr. Massey is very pure and sweet, and frequently rivals the most genuine strains of Burns. But this "poet of the people" evinces a degree of culture, both of the imagination and expression, perhaps never equally exhibited by one so recently emerging from his bitter lot. The Ballad which gives title to this volume, is a tissue of poetic beauties, of which the Laureate himself might be proud; it is at once so elaborate and so simple. We make room for a few verses of this charming poem:—

"Babe Christabel was royally born!  
For when the earth was flusht with flowers,  
And drencht with beauty in rainbow showers,  
She came through golden gates of Morn.

"No chamber arras-pictured round,  
Where sunbeams golden gorgeous gloom,  
And touch its glories into bloom,  
And footsteps fall withouten sound,

"Was her Birth-place that merry May-morn;  
No gifts were heapt, no bells were rung,  
No healths were crown'd, no songs were sung,  
When dear Babe Christabel was born:

"But Nature on the darling smiled,  
And with her beauty's blessing crown'd:  
Love brooded o'er the hallowed ground,  
And there were Angels with the Child!

\* \* \* \* \*

"With glancing lights and shimmering shade,  
And cheeks that toucht and ripelier burn'd,  
May-Roses in at the lattice yearn'd  
A-tiptoe, and Good Morrow bade.

"No purple and fine linen might  
Be hoarded up for her sweet sake:  
But Mother's love shall clothe and make  
The little wearer richly dight!"

The Musings of a Spirit. A Poem. By George Marsland. London: Pickering. 1853.

Morbida; or, Passion Past, and other Poems. Saunders and Otley. 1854.

Summer Sketches. By Bessy Rayner Parkes. Chapman. 1854.

MR. MARSLAND'S little volume contains many striking thoughts, expressed with considerable felicity and force. His style, however, is too metaphysical to be read with continued pleasure. His sentiments, which are really sound and Christian, would be less liable to misconstruction in simple, axiomatic prose; and there is nothing, as it appears to us, in the substance of his "*Musings*," to make either the phrase or form of poetry desirable. There is no want of clearness in the author's language or ideas, separately considered; but the connexion of the whole is not so apparent as to secure a pleasurable sense of harmony and proportion.

The book called "*Morbida*"—and which needs no second title—is the production of one who has evidently received his inspiration at second hand. Unable to elaborate it for himself, he freely dilutes some of the finest of English poetry; but so feeble a menstruum cannot hold it in solution: much of it floats on his page in fragments, serving the place of mottoes; while still more sinks down, and forms a rich deposit of quotation in the shape of notes. A careless or malicious binder might cut off the interest of this volume by a single process of curtailment.

Miss Bessy Rayner Parkes writes clever verses in nervous and well-chosen language. There is a freshness and raciness in these "*Sketches*" which is very pleasing; but the pleasure is diminished by occasional intimations of sympathy with certain new views respecting woman and her social position, more popular in America than in this country.

The Ultimate and Proximate Results of Redemption: chiefly deduced from the Oath sworn unto Abraham. By H. E. Head, A.M., Rector of Feniton, Devon. London: Arthur Hall, Virtue, and Co. 1854.

ON opening this volume, we were rather taken by surprise to find, in the course of a few pages, that by the "*ultimate* results of redemption" was intended nothing less than the final and eternal restoration of the entire race of man; and that the main object of the author was to establish that dogma. And we were scarcely less surprised to find that by the "*proximate* results" we are to understand, first, the salvation of the righteous in this life, and then—as "preliminary to the full development of the great and final results of redemption—the judgments of God, issuing from his more awful attributes of justice and holiness, in their tremendous majesty, overwhelming, like the depths of the *ocean*, the impenitent sinners with *fiery* indignation, and the trembling saints with horrible fear for 'the ungodly that forsake thy (his) law.'" His starting-point, in the formation of his creed on the subject of redemption, appears to have been the doctrine of unconditional *election*, as *generally* held by the Calvinistic school; but



he has been evidently startled, and frightened "out of his propriety," by the consequences which he has felt or supposed to be logically deducible from "that form of doctrine." So, from what we should be disposed to call the extreme of believing *too little*, as to the extent and results of redemption, he has passed—by a process of sentiment rather than of reasoning—than which nothing is more natural and common—to the opposite extreme of believing *too much*. And in this extreme he is disposed to rest.

"According to the gospel of apocryphal angels," he says, "the whole mass of mankind, a very small fragmentary part excepted, are created for the purpose of suffering, are predestined to suffer (a distinction without a difference is all that we gain, when we endeavour to distinguish in these cases) intense torture through the countless ages of eternity; so that, millions after millions of centuries having passed away, their torments are always beginning, and never ending. But, according to Scripture, directly, inferentially, and typically, a very different doctrine is taught. Jehovah is good to all, and his tender mercies shall be over all his works. He will not always chide, nor keep his anger for ever. The remedy which his love has provided will be more than co-extensive with the evil which his wisdom permitted; and the remedy, efficacious, in the first instance, in regard to the *elect*, shall prove universally efficacious at last. All shall be restored,—all shall be brought to Christ."—Pp. 7, 8.

The author's definitions of various theological terms are, where it seems necessary, expanded and *liberalized*, so as to harmonize with this theory. And the following is an instance of expansion in the meaning of a term, in accommodation to the author's expanded views of the great subject of his volume:—

"The righteousness of Christ," he says, "is the free gift of God, —a remedy co-extensive with, efficacious against, and superabundant over, the evil incurred by the fall of man; which remedy, causing, as its primary effect, a salutary hatred of sin in all who receive it, effectually works the salvation, first of the elect, subsequently of all mankind."—P. x.

Where such alteration is not necessary for that purpose, his definitions retain the strict Calvinian type, as in the following instance:—

"*Grace* is a state of indefectible security, acceptance, favour, and friendship with Jehovah, undeserved and unsought by men, supposing the temporary co-existence of a new and holy with a fallen and corrupt nature, the sin of the latter being atoned for."—P. xiv.

These extracts give a fair specimen of the author's conception and treatment of his main subject, as well as of the subjects of the Millennium, the New Creation, and other topics which he takes up, as being ancillary to it. The work is written in a warm, evangelical tone; and the exhortations in which it abounds, and which suggest the idea that the work was, in great part, composed in the form of sermons, are earnest and practical. But, independently of what we have already noted, he deals in interpretations and comments, in which we cannot follow him. As, when he says, "The appointment of Matthias" (to be an Apostle in the place of Judas) "was an act of hasty zeal, rebuked, in due time, by the appointment of Paul;" that "Melchizedek was not a

type of Christ, but of believers;" and that "the bright beam of 'universal grace' shines away all difficulties."—P. 64. The theory of Mr. Head, like many others, raises more cloud and mist than it dispels.

**My Schools and Schoolmasters; or, The Story of my Education.**

By Hugh Miller, Author of "The Old Red Sandstone,"

&c. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. 1854.

THE able author of "The Old Red Sandstone," and "Footprints of the Creator," has here given an instructive and interesting record of the progress of his own mental training. The son of a small Cromarty shipmaster,—his family connexions being amongst the better class of mechanics, and himself working for many years as a stonemason,—he is fully competent to describe the habits, feelings, and tendencies of the working population, and has brought out his views upon these questions in the form of a running commentary upon his own career. The work traces, in graceful language, the steps by which a thoughtful lad, favoured by no external advantages, was led to cultivate his powers of observation, until he has become a geologist of European reputation. The solitary sea-shore, the storm-beaten cliff, the wild ravine and heathery moor, have formed, in conjunction with the serious moral instruction of the humble domestic circle, the chief stimulants of his onward progress, as they have stood to him in place of academic halls. We trace his career, from hewing stones in a quarry, till we find him recognised in literature as the Editor of the "Witness," and in science as the author of two of the most popular works in the range of geology.

We quote the following remarks as worthy of the attention of those who have charge of youth: "There is a transition-time in which the strength and independence of the latent man begin to mingle with the wilfulness and indiscretion of the mere boy, which is more perilous than any other, and in which many more downward careers of recklessness and folly begin, that end in wreck and ruin, than in all the other years of life which intervene between childhood and old age. The growing lad should be wisely and tenderly dealt with at this critical stage. The severity that would fain compel the implicit submission yielded at an earlier period, would probably succeed, if his character were a strong one, in insuring but his ruin. It is at this transition-stage that boys run off to sea from parents and masters, or, when tall enough, enlist in the army for soldiers. The strictly orthodox parent, if more severe than wise, succeeds, occasionally, in driving, during this crisis, his son into Popery or infidelity; and the sternly moral one, in landing his in utter profligacy. But, leniently and judiciously dealt with, the dangerous period passes: in a few years, at most,—in some instances, in even a few months,—the sobriety incidental to a further development of character ensues, and the wild boy settles down into a rational young man."

The reflections upon the state and prospects of the working classes are among the best portions of the work. The following discriminating remarks have reference primarily to Scotland, but will apply to the same classes elsewhere: "Between the workmen that pass seden-

tary lives within doors, such as weavers and tailors, and those who labour in the open air, such as masons and ploughmen, there exists a grand generic difference. Sedentary mechanics are usually less contented than laborious ones; and as they almost always work in parties, and as their comparatively light, though often long and wearily-plied, employments do not so much strain their respiratory organs but that they can keep up an interchange of ideas when at their toils, they are generally much better able to state their grievances, and much more fluent in speculating on their causes. They develop more freely than the laborious out-of-door workers of the country, and present, as a class, a more intelligent aspect. On the other hand, when the open-air worker does so overcome his difficulties as to get fairly developed, he is usually of a fresher and more vigorous type than the sedentary one. Burns, Hogg, Allan Cunningham, are the literary representatives of the order; and it will be found that they stand considerably in advance of the Thoms, Bloomfields, and Tannahills that represent the sedentary workmen. The silent, solitary, hard-toiled men, if nature has put no better stuff in them than that of which stump-orators and Chartist lecturers are made, remain silent, repressed by their circumstances; but if of a higher grade, and if they once do get their mouths opened, they speak with power, and bear with them into our literature the freshness of the green earth, and the freedom of the open sky."

The volume contains much relating to the writer's favourite geological pursuits, and is well calculated to create a love for the beauties and marvels of nature. To the young, especially to those who are apt to consider their humble circumstances as adverse to mental cultivation, the work will prove as stirring as a trumpet-blast, which calls them, by precept and example, to the exercise and development of such latent powers as they possess.

Notices et Portraits Historiques et Littéraires. Par M. Mignet, de l'Académie Française, Secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques. Deux Vols. 18mo. Paris: Charpentier.

WITH the exception of the volumes which we now propose to consider briefly, all M. Mignet's works have, we believe, appeared before the public in an English translation; and, assuredly, if the "*Notices et Portraits Historiques*" are still comparatively unknown on this side of the Channel, it is from no inferiority on their part. They evidence, indeed, a decided improvement upon the author's "*History of the French Revolution*," inasmuch as they do not betray what we should call the *esprit de système*, which is so apparent in almost every paragraph of the earlier production. They have, besides, the peculiar merit of completing M. Mignet's philosophical *résumé*, and of illustrating fully several incidents in the greatest event of modern times. Most of the men whose biography M. Mignet has written, all those, in fact,—except Livingston,—who appeared in the first edition, are indissolubly connected with the Revolution; and they have, more or less, contributed to the establishment of the political institutions which superseded the *ancien régime*. Sieyès, Rœderer, Talleyrand, Broussais,

Merlin, Destutt de Tracy, Daunou, Michaud, Raynouard, Frayssinous,—such are the chief names which grace M. Mignet's Gallery of Portraits: such are a few of the characters he has judged with an impartiality we would gladly see more general amongst historians. M. Cousin once said of our author: "*Ah! voilà M. Mignet, qui dit avec dignité des choses justes!*" No better motto could be prefixed to the *Notices*.

One thought must strike painfully all those who will read with attention these beautiful volumes. The French Revolution was the only great social movement whose leaders proclaimed a direct antagonism to religion. The *Idéologues*, as Bonaparte called them, the members of the Auteuil Society, were the disciples of the *Encyclopédie*. Applying to moral questions that vigorous analytical process which they had inherited from Condillac, and which had achieved such splendid results in the sphere of science, they reduced virtue to a mathematical formula, and inaugurated utilitarianism. Thus, by a natural deduction, Broussais was brought to consider man as a mere assemblage of well-appointed organs. "He does not recognise in him," writes M. Mignet, "a spiritual principle distinct from the material element. Man feels through his nerves; his *viscera* are the seat of his passions and instincts; thought is produced in his brain; his personality resides in his organism. But this is not all. These various sets of apparatus are the *cause* of the phenomena just now stated. Feeling is a nervous product; passion, a visceral aid; intellect, a cerebral secretion; and the *ego*, a general property of living matter."

For a society composed of beings thus constituted, Volney's Catechism, and Destutt de Tracy's Commentaries on Montesquieu, formed an appropriate legislative code; but how long could a society of *Encyclopedistes* last? That was another question. The First Consul took upon himself to solve the difficulty, by refusing the sanction of his genius and of his power to the Utopian schemes which originated with the Voltairean school of philosophers. If the attacks directed against Christianity were marked by a violence amounting generally to downright rabidity, we must acknowledge, *per contra*, that the Ultramontanist reaction, which unavoidably took place at the beginning of the Restoration, ran into excesses of another description. MM. de Bonald, Joseph de Maistre, and de Lamennais exposed the absurdities of materialist infidelity; but with all their talent, their logic, and their eloquence, they did not succeed in bolstering up Jesuitism.

The notices of Count Siméon, Sismondi, Charles Comte, Ancillon, Bignon, Rossi, Cabanis, Droz, originally delivered, as well as their predecessors, in the shape of discourses at the public sittings of the *Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, have been added by M. Mignet, since the first edition of this work. Want of space prevents us from doing more than merely express our admiration of the lucidity and power with which these several *morceaux* are written. We might apply to the author the compliment he paid one day to M. Flourens, and say most sincerely that in *éloge*-literature he has equalled Fontenelle, Thomas, d'Alembert, and Cuvier. The Life of Franklin came out a few years ago as a pamphlet, when Socialist doctrines had reached their climax of popularity.

The *Journal des Débats* for June 28th, 1853, contained a panegyric on Theodore Jouffroy, which was rather sharply, but justly, criticized at

the time of its appearance. M. Mignet, we are afraid, is too much inclined to consider the *Institut de France* as a proper focus of opposition against the Government. He cannot forget the warfare he conducted in the *National* thirty years since, and which ended with the Revolution of 1830. But, between ourselves, the less said of what was then called *la Jeune France*, the better. Jouffroy, notwithstanding all his talent as a writer, is a teacher for whom we can feel no sympathy: he was the representative of a generation of men who had all the scepticism of the Auteuil coterie, without their indomitable energy,—men tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine, oscillating between Saint-Simonism, Fourierism, and Hegelianism; and of whom Alfred de Musset has so aptly exclaimed:—

*"L'hypocrisie est morte,—on ne croit plus aux prêtres;  
Mais la vertu se meurt,—on ne croit plus à Dieu."*

Such lives should be held up to us as warnings, not as patterns for imitation.

Mémoires d'Alexandre Dumas. Première Série, Quinze Vols.;  
Seconde Série, Vols. I.-V. Bruxelles: Méline.  
Mémoires d'un Bourgeois de Paris. Par le Docteur L. Véron.  
Vols. I., II. Paris: Gabriel de Gonet.

THE nineteenth century has only just accomplished half its career, and we find it already settling its accounts with posterity. Whether a feeling of vanity prompts MM. Alexandre Dumas and Véron to make their confessions to the public, or that they are actually moved by the praiseworthy desire of assuming their share of the common responsibility, it would be difficult to determine: at all events, Number One protrudes itself just now with more than usual boldness before the reading world, and every *homme de lettres*, casting his looks back upon the events of the last fifty years, confidently exclaims, on behalf of each of the authors, "*Quorum pars magna fui!*"

There is, we freely acknowledge, much truth in this; the period comprised between 1800 and 1852 has been the golden age of the "Fourth Estate;" and our French "brethren of the quill" have had a long opportunity of showing their abilities as political rulers. We do not wish to explain how they betrayed the trust confided to them,—how they brought about their own ruin,—how they degraded the press to the vilest purposes; but when, as early as 1842, M. Alphonse Karr wrote the following sentences, he was only saying aloud what was in every one's mind:—

"The press (observe, only *tua res agitur*, French Journalism) is a power which may be compared to a fungus; for it is self-produced.

"The press is a fungus which sprang up one morning from the *detritus* of all the other powers.

"The press has devoured every thing else.

"The liberty of the press has fattened on the substance of every other liberty.

"It is bursting from indigestion and plethora."

Such circumstances, however, are precisely those which render the recent works of Alexandre Dumas and of Dr. Véron highly interesting; and when M. Villemain has completed his Autobiography, when the promised Memoirs of MM. Guizot and Lamennais and of Madame Sand



appear, we shall be able to judge pretty correctly the political and literary history of France since the Restoration.

M. Véron's volumes seem carefully written; they contain particulars, hitherto unknown, respecting some leading characters of the day; and the moral sentiments in which the Doctor habitually indulges are good, although rather solemn, considering that they proceed from the pen of a quondam-director of the opera. The best part of the work is, we should say, still to come.

Alexandre Dumas maintains his reputation as the *Scudéry* of the nineteenth century,—

"Dont la fertile plume  
Peut tous les mois sans peine enfanter un volume."

His Memoirs are assuming a most formidable shape; and, the twentieth instalment bringing us only down to the year 1832, we may expect that the sum total will be what is called, in algebraical language, "an impossible quantity." Still, these biographical reminiscences deserve to be read. The chapters on Victor Hugo, Charles Nodier, Rabbe, Lamennais, are excellent: the account of the revolution of 1830 is dashed off in a spirited manner.

Our experience of men and things does not go so far back as A.D. 1800; but whilst perusing the works noticed in this article, we could not help remarking how many *grands hommes* there mentioned have outlived an apparently well-earned reputation. Geniuses who were to change the constitution of society,—if still belonging to our sublimary world,—have sobered down into model Conservatives; *femmes incomprises* are reconciled to the happiness of the fire-side; and hirsute critics, who pronounced the funeral oration of *ce polisson de Racine*, would most certainly recommend to you a few weeks' stay at a lunatic asylum, if you were to preach in a *feuilleton* the literary doctrines they were wont to advocate thirty years ago. The Memoirs of Alexandre Dumas have some of the features of a vast necropolis; and we have found enshrined in those catacombs several worthies respecting whom the wonder is that they ever emerged from oblivion.

**Les Guêpes: Mœurs Contemporaines.** Par M. Alphonse Karr.  
Quatre Vols. Paris: Victor Lecou.

We do not intend, in our reviews of French literature, to omit the lighter productions which are still poured forth with undiminished energy. The Balzac school of novels, the works of Eugène Sue, and the earlier rights-of-women effusions of George Sand, have been handled by other critics: they are now judged as pictures of a society whose distinguishing feature was refined corruption. We feel inclined neither to revert to Frederic Soulié's *Mémoires du Diable*, nor to search into the metaphysical refinements of *La Peau de Chagrin*; but keenness of observation is not always allied with grossness, and novelists do not invariably select for their heroes the stars of the "Newgate Calendar." Madame Ancelot's *Gabrielle*, and Madame Emile de Girardin's *Lorgnon*, are sketches we can safely recommend to our readers. Emile Souvestre's sombre descriptions betray the author's honest indignation at the hollowness of our boasted conventionalisms; and M. Louis Reybaud is a satirist the accuracy of whose views few will venture to dispute.

Amongst the modern French writers entitled to attention as faithful delineators of men and manners, M. Alphonse Karr holds a conspicuous rank. Under the oddest appellations, and an uncommon display of eccentricity, he has published a goodly shelf-full of novels, which, remarkable as they are for imagination and style, seem still more so as effusions of the most brilliant wit. *Les Guêpes* originally appeared in monthly numbers or volumes, containing bitter, but not offensive, criticisms on all the follies and absurdities of the day. Issued for the first time more than ten years ago, they immediately obtained great popularity, and, as is usual in such cases, conjured up a host of imitators. M. Léon Gozlan's *Nouvelles à la Main*, however, and *le bibliophile* Jacob's *Papillons Noirs*, were soon forgotten; whilst M. Karr's "Wasps" went on stinging in every direction with renewed energy. We have selected this work for peculiar notice, because it exhibits the chief features of the author's talent; and we think that a judicious selection of paragraphs taken from *Les Guêpes*, and from M. Karr's novels, would produce a volume worthy of being placed by the side of La Rochefoucauld's *Maximes*.

The Tent and the Altar: or, Sketches of Patriarchal Life. By the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D., F.R.S. London: Arthur Hall, Virtue, and Co. 1854.

The Comforter: or, Thoughts on the Influences of the Holy Spirit. By the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. London: Arthur Hall, Virtue, and Co. 1854.

The Great Sacrifice: or, The Gospel according to Leviticus. By the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. London: J. F. Shaw. 1854.

Signs of the Times: or, The Moslem and his End, the Christian and his Hope. By the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. London: Arthur Hall, Virtue, and Co. 1854.

THERE is a degree of literary productiveness, which almost of itself evinces genius. Apart from their intrinsic merits, we have always admired the fulness and fertility of the Puritan Divines, who never knew when to lay down the pen, while the love of God and the wants of men both prompted and supplied the theme. Even their dullest productions frequently testify to prodigious merit. Works which it is now a labour of patience to read, it was then a mere labour of love to indite; and to the composition of those heaviest folios was brought an amount of zeal and diligence, of knowledge and ingenuity, of warmth of heart and strength of purpose, which is the chief *substratum* of all genuine greatness, and without which the life of genius is the broken dream of one who "dies, and makes no sign." The fastidious essayist or poet may occasionally save his own much-cherished fame by a different proceeding; but these men had higher views of life and literature, and, exerting the sinews of their minds, acquitted themselves like men, to serve their generation. Their talents were not selfishly employed to adorn a solitary name, but given to consolidate the social and religious greatness of their country. The hope of present usefulness inspired them more than fame; but their fruit was not so limited: they laboured, and every generation of their countrymen has entered into their labours.

The great productiveness of Dr. Cumming has reminded us of this famous class of writers; but it is only justice to say, that our author will sustain the comparison on the higher grounds of sincerity and usefulness; in other points there is necessarily more of difference. If he does not reach their occasional flights, at least he avoids their besetting faults. If his reflections are not often so weighty or original, neither is he frequently guilty of their tediousness or obscurity. To recommend the precious truths of religion, he brings both novel and familiar graces. There is a fertility of ideas, a readiness of expression, and a freshness of manner in his discourses, which are very pleasing to a large majority both of hearers and of readers. He does not hesitate to make art and science, and every branch of literature and knowledge, tributary to his theme. To illustrate God's word, he goes freely to God's works. To impress a human heart with saving truth, he does not disdain to use the language of human genius. A fact, a verse, or a pleasing metaphor, is welcome, and employed with great adroitness. He does not disdain the best of arguments because they are old, nor the most appropriate of analogies because they are humble. Every beauty of religion has been recognised and set forth over and over again; but there is, therefore, only the more room for choice among these innumerable good things. The originality is in the selection, the grouping, the application, the spirit that animates the whole appeal: and the works of Dr. Cumming evince that this originality is his in a remarkable degree. His continued popularity is to be attributed to these undoubted merits; and in view of the general soundness and practical tendency of his teaching, we cannot but think this popularity the sign, as well as the source, of a large religious influence.

The volumes above enumerated are marked by the author's usual qualities. The first three are especially to be commended for their devout spirit and practical tendency. The last is not, we think, so unexceptionable. One who undertakes a mission so popular, and therefore so important, as that of Dr. Cumming, should avoid the danger of either limiting or abusing his influence, by giving currency to questionable interpretations of prophecy and history. It is clear that he who runs may write as well as read; but the *signs of the times* are not so definite as to be thus easily construed.

**A Portraiture of the late Rev. William Jay, of Bath. An Outline of his Mind, Character, and Pulpit Eloquence: with Notes of his Conversations, and an Estimate of his Writings and Usefulness. By the Rev. Thomas Wallace. London: Hall, Virtue, and Co. 1854.**

MR. JAY was no ordinary man. Eminent for the gifts both of nature and of grace, he was further distinguished by their lengthened and successful exercise. He was, moreover, the property of the Church Catholic. Living only for usefulness, he was ready to serve every sect. His departure is mourned by all; for he instructed and delighted all by his ministry, and will, for many years to come, by his writings. His influence was great, and salutary as it was extensive; and this rather by the use and direction of his talents, than by their measure. Mr. Jay did not aim primarily at meeting the public taste,

but at serving his generation according to the will of God; but had he aimed at it, he could not have more exactly hit his mark in the style of addressing the public ear. His works will long be read, especially in the closet; and this is real usefulness; and those in Cæsar's palace show their wisdom in adopting at least a few books that have not received the *imprimatur* of titled ecclesiastics; and even these find their account in keeping a few Dissenters within reach; and, in both cases, Mr. Jay among the rest.

Doubtless we shall have many volumes of sermons, opinions, and reminiscences of the Pastor of Argyle Chapel. Any records of so eminent a man must be expected to interest the public mind; but every thing that an eminent man has said ought not to be recorded, and kept ready to be brought out in a book as soon as he shall depart this life. We object to the practice; and we think Mr. Jay's friends will not be satisfied with the present specimen. It is disfigured by the insertion of many things which are not worthy of preservation, and in a style that no one can recognise as Mr. Jay's. Due pains are taken to exalt him in our estimation, but the praise is powerless from want of discrimination, and from being over-done; for it almost exhausts the English vocabulary of adjectives and adverbs, which are strung together as boys string birds' eggs. The same things are also often repeated. Many things attributed to Mr. Jay, being broken off from their connexion, exhibit his character, at the least, imperfectly, and sometimes, we think, disadvantageously: and many of the remarks on his character and writings are jejune and common-place.

A Brief Memoir of the late Rev. W. Howels, Minister of Long-Acre Chapel, London. By the Rev. E. Morgan, M.A. London: Partridge, Oakey, and Co.

AN admirable piece of biography, clearly setting forth the history and character of its subject, and teaching the most important lessons, especially to Ministers. Mr. Howels is well remembered as an Episcopal Minister, who for seventeen years preached the Gospel in Long-Acre chapel, with legitimate popularity and great success. His early life was attended with so much affliction and weakness, that he was not able to complete that University course of study which he pursued for some time with characteristic ardour; but the deficiency was more than made up by the energy of his mind, the inventiveness of his genius, and his devotedness to his work. He was brought to the acknowledgment of the truth, while at Oxford, under the ministry of the Rev. J. Howard Hinton, a Baptist Minister; and this circumstance naturally led to a lasting friendship, and tended, no doubt, to enhance Christian catholicity of feeling. Mr. Howels consecrated all his powers to the service of Christ. He was a vigorous thinker; and although his sermons seldom exhibited, throughout, the same sustained power, yet they were all distinguished by passages of great originality and beauty. He excelled as a controversialist; but minor subjects of dispute did not form the staple of his ministry. He was fearless in opposing error, especially Irvingism, Socinianism, and Popery; and never scrupled to call things by their right names. As a Pastor, he was wise, discriminating, affectionate, and faithful. His last affliction was brief, and his death unexpected; but the scene was most charac-

teristic of the man,—full of thought, full of faith, full of feeling: it was beautiful, impressive, glorious.

The volume exhibits a large impression of Calvinistic sentiments, somewhat dogmatically stated, and sometimes, we think, too briefly to express the writer's meaning, and, generally, begging the whole question. We have neither disposition nor space for controversy, or there are many fair occasions; for example, p. 158, where Mr. Howels draws an unwarranted distinction between the conduct of God as a Sovereign and as a Judge, in the supposed absolute election of some to eternal life. If it be "unjust" in God as a Judge to do any thing, the same thing must be "unjust" in God as a Sovereign; for infinite perfection belongs to him in the one character as truly as in the other. And is not this extravagant? "The righteousness of Christ hath driven sin to all the distance of infinity and eternity from the believer. *He is as separate from sin as the Saviour himself*; he partakes in all the glory of Christ, like as a wife in all the honours of her husband." —P. 257. Unless some occult sense is couched in this language, an explanation would reduce all to mere rhetoric: the "sinless perfection" attributed to, but not held by, Arminians, would appear a moderate sentiment in comparison.

But we have no quarrel with the Editor. Mr. Howels' was a beautiful Christian character, and his excellent biographer has done justice to his subject, and given us a convenient, instructive, and edifying book; and we respect the motives which have led him to delay it so long. If the Church-of-England and the Dissenting pulpits were all filled with men of Mr. Howels' spirit, Christianity would soon have a splendid triumph.

**The Works of Oliver Goldsmith.** Edited by Peter Cunningham. In Four Vols. London: John Murray. 1854.

**The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.** By Edward Gibbon, Esq. With Notes by Dean Milman and M. Guizot. Edited, with additional Notes, by William Smith, LL.D. In Eight Vols. Vols. I. and II. London: John Murray. 1854.

We should consider our functions very imperfectly fulfilled, did we omit occasionally to introduce to the notice of our readers, by way of recommendation or caution, such new editions of standard works as we may consider valuable or otherwise. There is constantly rising around us a fresh *stratum* of readers, whose bookshelves require to be furnished, and who need the aid of greater experience than their own, to enable them to act prudently in this matter. There are few things more characteristic of the taste and judgment of men than their libraries. One will be bulky, expensive, and yet of little worth; another, compact, well-chosen, and of permanent value. The cost, too, is a material point, and one which, since it is relative, requires the balancing of various considerations. The lowest-priced book is not always the cheapest, and the more costly ones may yet be the greatest bargain.

It would be impertinent to speak upon the merits of the two standard works, new editions of which we now announce. The Muse of History has never reached a loftier strain than in the pages of



Gibbon. The beauty of his style, the fulness and accuracy of his information, and the remarkable lucidness of his arrangement, will ever cause it to rank amongst the greatest efforts of the human mind in its own department, notwithstanding the damning stain of the cold, sneering, anti-Christian spirit of certain well-known chapters. Thus it is the more needful that it should be edited by a man acute and learned enough to supply artful omissions, correct false inferences, and neutralize the sarcasm which sometimes lies couched in an epithet.

With respect to the writings of the humorous and genial Goldsmith, —whom Dr. Johnson, in allusion to his wonderful insight into human nature, and ludicrous ignorance of human affairs, designated “an inspired idiot,” —there is ample scope for good editing, in regard to the purity of the text, and the elucidation of obscure allusions to contemporary events. Who would not wish to have “The Deserted Village,” “The Vicar of Wakefield,” and the “Essays,” presented to future ages in all the perfection to be obtained by the most sedulous and sympathizing care?

The editions now offered by Mr. Murray, are every way worthy of the patronage of those who would have convenient size, elegant typography, and careful supervision, combined with a moderate price. The series, of which the above form a part, will be the best and cheapest hitherto presented to the public; and we trust their circulation will be commensurate with their deserts.

Dr. Smith and Mr. Cunningham are, perhaps, the most suitable men living, to fulfil judiciously their respective tasks; the one from his well-known familiarity with classical history, the other from his acquaintance with the minute literary history of the last century.

**Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life:** designed particularly for the Consideration of those who are seeking Assurance of Faith and Perfect Love. By Thomas C. Upham. Ninth Edition. Liverpool: Edward Howell.

THIS is the reprint of an American book. Mr. Upham, we believe, is an Independent Minister, of estimable character, and good talents. There is a peculiarity about this work that may be worth noticing; — it is written entirely in the spirit, and embraces the doctrinal views, of Wesleyan Methodism. How Mr. Upham came to emerge from the doctrines of his school into Evangelical Arminianism, we cannot tell. We presume, however, that the author refers to this point in his short and modest Preface, when he says, “There are reasons, of a personal nature, why I should not have written. There are other reasons, which none can appreciate but myself, which seemed to me imperatively to require it.” We can easily understand these two classes of “reasons.” The “personal” side of the matter would arise out of the fire which the announcement of these opinions would kindle amongst the author’s religious connexions; and the “imperative” obligation referred to, would be a conviction of conscious duty to God, — fidelity to the truth. How far Mr. Upham’s auguries have been realized, we have no means of knowing; but have heard that his book has made no small stir of several kinds amongst his friends. That it has done good, we can have no doubt; for this must attend its perusal, wherever

read; and, moreover, that it will have produced no small "*commotion*" in the Calvinistic Churches of the States, and especially amongst the Ministers, who, whatever party they belong to, are always the last to suspect any flaw in their system, and the last to give in when the discovery is made.

Be this as it may, we can very heartily recommend this work to the attention and perusal of our readers. It is not polemic, but eminently practical; its spirit is in perfect harmony with its subject,—pure, charitable, and earnest; its style is clear, and its reasoning cogent and forcible; and, above all, the whole scheme and ideal of the author is purely scriptural. To our Methodist friends, the design of the author, as stated by himself, namely, that it is intended for those who are "seeking assurance of faith and perfect love," will, of itself, be a powerful recommendation. We can assure them, they will meet with no disappointment. The main object is never lost sight of;—the spiritual life, holiness to the Lord, and perfect love, all attained through faith in the redemption of Christ, and ratified and sealed by the Holy Spirit, constitute its teaching from beginning to end. Mr. Upham is no enthusiast. His subject is interspersed with most valuable and important directions in many matters of inward conflict, trials of faith, and practical duty. Those who desire to "make their calling and election sure," may advantageously place this book, on the "*Interior or Hidden Life*," by the side of their choicest guides, and consult it daily for their spiritual edification.

**The Incarnate Son of God: or, The History of the Life and Ministry of the Redeemer.** By the Rev. Henry W. Williams. London: Mason. 1853.

WE ought sooner to have noticed this valuable little volume, which we strongly recommend to our readers, and especially to the heads of families, for the use of intelligent young persons. Greswell's "*Harmony*" is, with very few exceptions, followed in the arrangement; and a large amount of valuable criticism and illustration is furnished in reference to the facts and doctrines of the evangelical history. The style is well suited to a narrative intended to prove and illustrate a doctrine,—clear, elevated, and conclusive; and although still more frequent occasion might have been taken formally to employ the facts of the history to *prove* that Jesus is the incarnate Son of God, to show that the facts necessarily imply the Divinity of Christ, yet but one conviction can arise,—that God was manifest in the flesh. Mr. Williams has done good service by his publication.

**Lectures on Architecture and Painting, delivered at Edinburgh, November, 1853.** By John Ruskin. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1854.

THE name of Mr. Ruskin is probably familiar to all our readers, as that of the most eloquent and original art-critic of the present day. But his chief works are both costly and elaborate, and so not likely to have fallen in the way, or to have engaged the attention, of many who may yet desire to see a brief statement of doctrines so widely admired, and yet so strongly challenged. The present volume is well adapted to

meet this want. It consists of a brief and practical summary of Mr. Ruskin's teaching, both in architecture and painting; and it affords glimpses, at least, of that profound insight and religious reverence which distinguish this author from all his predecessors in the walks of æsthetic criticism.

Mr. Ruskin's architectural "dogmas," or "heresies," as they are variously considered, are distinctly re-affirmed in this volume. That there may be no room for misconstruction, wilful or otherwise, he puts them into categorical form under the six following heads:—

"I. That Gothic or Romanesque construction is nobler than Greek construction.

"II. That ornamentation is the principal part of architecture.

"III. That ornamentation should be visible.

"IV. That ornamentation should be natural.

"V. That ornamentation should be thoughtful.

"VI. And that, therefore, Gothic ornamentation is nobler than Greek ornamentation, and Gothic architecture the only architecture which should now be built."

These propositions, bold and uncompromising as they are, are briefly, but ably, maintained by the author. In their naked assertion they may seem too bold and unwarranted; but the whole body of Mr. Ruskin's writings are a consistent and luminous commentary on these doctrines. We believe the day is not very distant when they will largely affect—if they do not thoroughly transform—the public and domestic architecture of this country.

Mr. Ruskin's third "Lecture" is occupied with "Turner, and his Works." On that interesting subject we must not at present enter: but we should not omit to say, that the lecturer's admiration is not lessened, but rather "grows by what it feeds on." The fourth "Lecture" is devoted to "Pre-Raphaelitism," and welcomes the rising school of artists with encouragement, all the more flattering as it is so evidently honest and intelligent.

We should not hesitate to recommend the writings of Mr. Ruskin to the perusal of our readers, even if his views had met with yet stronger opposition from professional authority. Deliberate confutation has never been offered to those views; but even granting, for the moment, that some deduction should be made from the negative and denunciatory part of his decisions,—that, for example, a writer as able as himself might redeem Greek architecture from the degradation it has suffered at his hands, and even lift it to rivalry, in abstract merit at the least, with his favourite and incomparable Gothic,—there is still such a large proportion of positive and undeniable truth in his volume, such an affluence and mastery of beautiful details, and, above all, such a keen recognition of principles dividing at once the false from the true, that they must always have the finest relish for minds unprejudiced and catholic. If ever any author vindicated his own claims to respectful attention, and then intrenched himself in the generous, but reasonable, confidence of his readers, that author is Mr. Ruskin. With all the force of Carlyle, and even a greater command of powerful language, his writings are distinguished by far more directness of purpose, of practical good sense, and profound moral truth. The simplest cannot mistake, while the strongest are not able

to resist him. There is no need of the knowledge of a connoisseur to feel convinced that his judgments in art are, for the most part, irreversible; nor of the accurate lore of the naturalist to recognise his fine appreciation of the features of nature. It is easy to decry this man, and say he is a rhapsodist. Dulness will quote his very eloquence against him, and thus pitifully evade his arguments. But his matchless knowledge of art, and his patient study of nature, are evident in every line of his writings, even more so than that commanding and vehement quality which sometimes gathers up these materials, and hurls them in a hurricane of scorn upon the head of feebleness and falsehood. He is never dogmatic till he has earned the right to be so; he gives no judgment till he has summed up all the evidence. It is not of ignorance, any more than of incompetence, that one shall easily convict this writer. In controversy, few can be so formidable, while yet submitting to the just restraints of truth and candour. His antagonist must be armed at all points; and even through the linked and twisted mail his subtle weapon will insert itself with terrible effect.

We can promise our readers an intellectual and moral feast in the perusal of this volume; and if they should be disposed to pursue any part of the subject under such a guide, we would recommend "The Seven Lamps of Architecture" as next in order. To those to whom these works are already familiar, of course our commendation will appear superfluous; but they who come to them for the first time, will learn to view art and nature and humanity with new feelings of delight; will feel their sympathies enlarged, and their enjoyments multiplied; above all, they will see, more clearly than they ever did before, that every fresh inquiry into the fields of nature and the principles of art serves to widen and confirm the evidence of natural and revealed religion. We may add, the marvellous imagery and perfect morals of the Bible receive no small elucidation from the researches of Mr. Ruskin.

**The Repentance of Nineveh.** A Metrical Homily on the Mission of Jonah. By Ephraem Syrus. Also, Exhortation to Repentance, and some smaller Pieces. Translated from the original Syriac, with an Introduction and Notes. By the Rev. Henry Burgess, Ph.D., &c. London: Blackader and Co. 1853.

We hail this second volume of translations from Ephraem Syrus; and we agree with the translator, that they will deepen the impressions produced by the minor pieces contained in the former volume. The "Repentance of Nineveh" is the longest and most important of Ephraem's "Exegetical Discourses." It appears to have been designed for use on occasions of humiliation and prayer, and particularly for the frequently-recurring occasions which were known in the Syrian Churches as the "fast of the Ninevites." And it conveys a very lively impression of the powers of his mind as well as of his piety, and of his thorough insight into the subject of which it treats, or of which, rather, it is a representation. Like the rest of the metrical homilies, it was composed for popular audiences; but it is wrought out upon artistic principles, and, but for the title under which it appears in his

Works, might be called a "poem" rather than a "homily." And it is with reference to this circumstance in particular, as Dr. Burgess shows, that the "almost entire absence of Christian ideas and associations may be accounted for,"—whether "satisfactorily" or not, some may be disposed to question.

The "Exhortation to Repentance" is in keeping with the "Repentance of Nineveh," and has the advantage of containing more direct reference to Christ as the Physician of souls. It may also be remarked, by the way, that it contains intimations that Ephraem believed in the doctrine of *free-will*,—as in the following lines:—

"Who will bestow on a captive  
The gift which is presented to me,  
That, if he pleases, he may continue in bondage,  
Or, if he wishes it, he may go free?  
Yet God places in thy hands  
These two things, over which thou hast power,—  
Either to be wounded with thy consent,  
Or to be healed with thy free concurrence."

In this piece, as in the preceding, there is evidence of a deep acquaintance with the innermost workings of a penitent spirit: and it appears to have been for this reason that this and other of the "Exhortations" were among the favourite readings of John Wesley, particularly in the earlier part of his religious career. Under date of Nov. 12th, 1736, he says, "I read to the people" (at Frederica) "one of the 'Exhortations' of Ephraem Syrus,—the most awakening writer, I think, of all the ancients." And, again, under date of Ash-Wednesday, 1747,—“I spent some hours in reading the 'Exhortations' of Ephraem Syrus. Surely, never did any man, since David, give us such a picture of 'a broken and contrite heart.'"

Dr. Burgess has greatly served the interests of Syriac literature by these translations and the "Notes" appended to them, as well as by the valuable historical and philological matter contained in the two "Introductions." It is to be hoped that he will continue to push his inquiries yet farther in the field which he has chosen; and that in due time we shall have, as the result, not only a better acquaintance with what is good in the writings of Ephraem, but also an improvement in Syriac Grammars and Lexicons, such as may tell to advantage on biblical criticism.

Night and the Soul. A Dramatic Poem. By J. Stanyan Bigg.  
London: Groombridge and Sons. 1854.

THIS is another poem of the school of "Balder," marked by the same extravagancies and inanities: sky without landscape,—colour without form,—sack intolerable and bread infinitesimal. Says Goethe, prince of modern critics, "I have no opinion of poems snatched out of the air." Say these young men, "We will weave our attenuated songs of nothing else: the air shall be our warp, and the moon-beam our woof; and you, orthodox believers in the creed of art, shall be astonished at the magnificent results." And, indeed, if the value of poetry be estimated by the amount of the reader's astonishment, their point is partly gained. The truth, however, is, that "Festus"—the first and best production of this school—had length and fulness and



redundance quite sufficient; every repetition of that author's manner is increasingly faint and fatiguing; its starry imagery and abnormal beauties lose every thing by iteration; and when the sense of surprise is lost, we are forced to observe how little there is to admire, and how much less to approve.

**Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission, principally among the Dens of London.** By R. W. Vanderkiste, late London City Missionary. London, 1854.

WE are glad to see a cheap edition of this interesting narrative. It is full of instructive and suggestive details, relative to the physical and moral evils which fester in the most neglected parts of this great metropolis. The first glimpse into these polluted haunts is naturally discouraging; but when we reflect upon the good resulting from the efforts of even a single Missionary, and the stimulus which these revelations are calculated to give to individual Christian effort, we are led to hail the solitary pioneers of a most important work. Mr. Vanderkiste pursued his labours in the proper spirit, and brought at once the genuine truths of the Gospel to bear upon the evils which he encountered; for experience teaches, that nothing is so well adapted to reclaim the lowest outcasts of ignorance and vice, as the immediate exhibition of Divine truth,—even the highest which we have to offer,—the redemption of a lost world by Jesus Christ.

**The Revelation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, historically and critically interpreted, &c.** By the Rev. Philip Gell, M.A., late Rural Dean of the District of Derby. Two Vols. London: Wertheim and Macintosh. 1854.

THE eagerness with which investigations into the true interpretation of Scripture prophecy is now carried on, is a marked feature of the times. Though it may be attended with some danger, it is nevertheless, when framed in a spirit of reverent submission to the Word of God, a favourable omen. Time was, when the glorious visions with which John was favoured in Patmos were almost ignored; and one portion of the sacred record, on account of the obscurity of some of its parts, failed to yield those lessons and excite those hopes, which it was designed to give.

Mr. Gell adopts the general views so ably maintained by the Rev. E. B. Elliot, in his "*Horæ Apocalyptice*," with some modifications and original speculations of his own. His opinions are illustrated by ample references to history; and the entire work is more interesting than we have found to be the case with many on the same subject.

**Evenings in my Tent; or, Wanderings in Balad Ejjareed. Illustrative of the Moral and Social Condition of the African Sahara.** By the Rev. N. Davis, F.R.S., S.A. Two Vols. Arthur Hall, Virtue, and Co. 1854.

THIS work has at least the advantage of referring to a portion of the globe, of which little is known. There are many reasons why Englishmen should feel interested in Africa; and we gladly avail ourselves of every addition to our scanty knowledge of its geography and climate, as well as of the customs and manners of its inhabitants.

Our author had resided several years on the shores of North Africa, when an opportunity occurred of visiting the tribes living in the interior of the African Sahara, in company with Sidy Mohammed Bey, the heir-apparent to the throne of Tunis.

In the course of Mr. Davis's narrative, we obtain curious glimpses into the social, moral, and physical condition of the people; but we could have wished the information had been systematized under appropriate divisions. The account of the ruins of Carthage is particularly interesting. Our limits forbid extracts; we must, therefore, refer such as feel an interest in the subject to the work itself. They will find some valuable suggestions as to the best mode of bringing Christian truth to operate upon the myriads of Africa.

**Invisibles, Realities; Demonstrated in the Holy Life and Triumphant Death of Mr. John Janeway, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.** By James Janeway, Minister of the Gospel. With an Introduction. By the Rev. S. Romilly Hall. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.; and John Mason. 1854.

A MORE interesting and profitable Memoir than that of Janeway, it would not be easy to point out. Distinguished for correct and evangelical thought, for rich experience of divine truth, and devoted regard to the honour of Christ and the glory of his kingdom, we esteem it singularly fitted to edify and encourage the Lord's people. The life of Janeway was as beautiful in its experimental and practical holiness, as his death was triumphant and glorious. Altogether it is a most precious gem of religious biography.

The introduction that accompanies the present reprint is appropriate and seasonable. The writer, with great felicity of language, clearness of scriptural doctrine, and piety of spirit, traces the formation and development of an intelligent and glowing religion, as exhibited in the life and death of this eminent saint. We scarcely know a book better fitted for usefulness than this, or one more suitable as a present to young people, and especially to those who desire to be qualified for efficient service in the Church of Christ. It has our hearty approval, and our best wishes that it may be extensively circulated.

**A Popular Account of the Ancient Egyptians.** Revised and abridged from the larger Work. By Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, D.C.L., F.R.S., &c. Illustrated with 500 Woodcuts. London: John Murray. 1854.

THE former well-known work of the learned author was too expensive for the generality of persons. Its merit was acknowledged on all hands, and its costliness was a subject of much regret. Mr. Murray and the author have now met the case, by this issue of the chief part of the original work in an elegant and compact form, and at a moderate price. Although called an abridgment, it is most complete in its information, and, indeed, in some respects, is superior to its predecessor, since it contains information derived during a recent visit to Egypt. The Egyptian is followed from the cradle to the mummy-pit, and is depicted in all his domestic and public avocations. Seeing that

archæology is now become a popular study,—thanks to the labours of Layard, Rawlinson, and others,—and that the remains of ancient Egypt have thrown great light upon the Assyrian monuments, we prognosticate a large sale for these volumes. We know of no work so amply illustrated.

Christ Glorified, in the Life, Experience, and Character of Joseph B. Shrewsbury. Written by his Father. Third Edition. London: Mason. 1854.

Christianity in Earnest, as exemplified in the Life and Labours of the Rev. Hodgson Casson. By A. Steel. Second Edition. London: Needham. 1854.

WE are glad to see new editions of these interesting Memoirs called for. Mr. Casson was distinguished by his zeal and usefulness. The brief, but remarkable, career of Mr. Shrewsbury furnishes an example of early maturity in divine grace still more rare and attractive. The last-mentioned little work may be particularly recommended to the young; yet it has lessons and consolations for the most advanced believer. It is admirably suited for the Christian; yet, if the sceptic could be induced to heed it, we perhaps could offer no stronger testimony to the divine origin of our religion.

The War with Russia, Imperative and Righteous. A Sermon Preached in Brunswick Chapel, Leeds, on the Day of National Humiliation. By the Rev. John H. James. London: John Mason. 1854.

THIS is a Sermon well suited to the times. In sentiment it is calm, philosophical, and Christian; and in style, clear, racy, and vigorous. Whilst the author deprecates war *per se*, he succeeds in proving that there are circumstances which render it righteous and politic for a great nation to engage in *defensive* war.

Select Extracts from the Diary and Correspondence of Leila Ada. By Osborn W. Heighway, Author of "Leila Ada," &c. London: Partridge, Oakey, and Co. 1854.

THIS is a sequel to the life of a most interesting Jewish convert. The graces and refinements of wealth and intellect are rendered more fascinating by being blended with the beauties of holiness. We have seldom read a more affecting record of deep personal piety; and we sincerely hope that its circulation, especially among well-educated young ladies, will be extensive.

The Friendships of the Bible. By Amicus. London: Partridge, Oakey, and Co. 1853.

The Biography of Samson, Illustrated and Applied. By the Rev. John Bruce, D.D., Minister of Free St. Andrew's Church, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1854.

THESE little works are creditable specimens of Scripture narrative illustrated and enforced. They breathe a spirit of unaffected evangelical piety. The former contains some pleasing engravings.

# INDEX.

- America*, the past and future of, 257—territorial growth of the United States, 259—physical advantages, 260—increase of population, 260—the first colonists Protestants, 261—Divine interposition in her early history, 262—English and American parallels, 265—dangers to which America is exposed from emigration, 267; from slavery, 271; from Romanism, 273; and from infidelity, 275—America's strength, 275.
- Anatomical Science*, its history and progress, 412—temples of health, 413—Hippocrates, 414—quoted, 415, 416—Euryphon, 417—Plato, 417—Aristotle, 418—Theophrastus and Erasistratus, 422—Herophilus, 423—medical schools of Alexandria, 423—the Elder Pliny, 423—Galen, 424—value of his writings, 427—a dark period, 427—the Arabian Physicians, 429—another dark period, 429—medical schools of France and Italy, 429—Vesalius, 430—Fallopian, Eustachius, and Servetus, 431—Harvey and his great discovery, 432—other important discoveries, 433—Professor Willis, 433—Kepler, and the eye, 435—microscopic investigations, 436—Leuwenhoeck, 437—comparative anatomy at the close of the seventeenth century, 438—worthies of that age, 438.
- Aristotle*, extent of his knowledge of anatomy, 418—quoted, 421.
- Arminianism*, evangelical, characteristics of, 209.
- Arnold*, Matthew, "Poems" of, noticed, 257.
- Atlantic and Pacific Oceans*, junction of the, 172—various plans of intercommunication, 173—the Mexican project, 174—the Nicaraguan route, 175—the Panama canal, 175—visionary project of a ship canal, 175—Panama Railway Company, 177—the Atrato route, and M. Humboldt, 179—obstacles to its realization, 180—superiority of the Atrato route, 182—inter-oceanic railway and navigation, 184.
- "*Balder*, a Poem," reviewed, 235.
- Barclay*, Robert, his views of the Church, 469.
- Barrett*, Rev. A., his "Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church," reviewed, 459.
- Baur*, sceptical theories of, 15, 66, *note*.
- Brief Literary Notices*:—Oliphant's Russian Shores of the Black Sea, and Brooks's Russians of the South, 277—Medway's Life and Writings of Dr. Pye Smith, 280—May Fair to Marathon, 282—Sainte-Beuve's *Causeries du Lan-*
- di*, 282—Cousin's *Madame de Longueville*, 283—Sayous' *Histoire de la Littérature Française*, 284—Dr. Chalybæus's *Historical Development of Speculative Philosophy*, 285—Sketches from Sacred History, 287—Finlay's *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 287—Harbaugh's *Will we Know our Friends in Heaven?* 288—Landon's *Imaginary Conversations*, and *Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, 289—Thodey's *Life in Death*, 291—Smith's *Gentile Nations*, 291—Leisure Hour, 299—Farrar's *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, 292—Hufeland's *Art of Prolonging Life*, 293—Dr. Young's *Complete Works*, 295—Flagg's *Venice*, 295—*Struggles for Life*, 296—Macaulay's *Speeches*, 566—Webb's *Sensibility of Separate Souls*, 569—Leatham's *Discovery*, 570—Massey's *Ballad of Babe Christabel*, 571—Marshall's *Musings of a Spirit*, *Morbida*, and *Parkes's Summer Sketches*, 572—Head's *Results of Redemption*, 572—Miller's *My Schools and Schoolmasters*, 574—Mignet's *Notices et Portraits*, 575—Mémoires d'Alexandre Dumas, and Véron's *Mémoires d'un Bourgeois de Paris*, 577—Karr's *Les Guêpes*, 578—Cunningham's *Tent and the Altar*, *Comforter*, *Great Sacrifice*, and *Signs of the Times*, 579—Wallace's *Portraiture of William Jay*, 580—Morgan's *Memoir of the Rev. W. Howels*, 581—Cunningham's *Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, and *Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, by Milman, Guizot, and Smith, 582—Upham's *Interior or Hidden Life*, 583—Williams's *Incaruate Son of God*, 584—Ruskin's *Lectures on Architecture and Painting*, 584—Ephraem Syrus's *Repentance of Nineveh*, 586—Bigg's *Night and the Soul*, 587—Vanderkiste's *Six Years' Mission among the Dens of London*, 588—Gell's *Revelation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, 588—Davis's *Evenings in my Tent*, 588—Hall's *Invisibles*, *Realities*, 589—Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, 589—Shrewsbury's *Christ Glorified*, and *Steel's Christianity in Earnest*, 590—James's *War with Russia*, 590—Heighway's *Select Extracts from the Diary and Correspondence of Leila Ada*, 590—Amicus's *Friendships of the Bible*, and Bruce's *Biography of Samson*, 590.
- Bunting*, Rev. Dr., preaching of, 363.
- California*, described, 96.
- Campbell*, Dr., his "Pulpit Eloquence" quoted, 369, *note*.

- Chalmers*, Dr., mental traits of, 191—manner in the pulpit, 232—change effected by, in pulpit ministrations, 355
- Chaucer*, Poetry of, 238
- Christian*, origin of the appellation, 77
- Christianity*, early difficulties of, 69
- Church of England*, modern pulpit ministrations in, 351
- Church* principles and polity, 459—highest meaning of "Church," 460—the term as used in Scripture, 462—definition of Archdeacon Wilberforce, 465—Romanist and Tractarian theories, 466—one-sided definitions, 469—external polity of the Church, 471—Christ's principles of Church polity, 472—permanent local Bishops, 475—precedents not legislative enactments, 477—Romish and Tractarian affinities, 479—Council at Jerusalem, 481—persons composing it, 482—appointment of Pastors, 485—letter of Cyprian, 486—cases of discipline considered, 488—Wesleyan Church polity, 493—lay participation in Church affairs, 493; in discipline, 495—Mr. Steward's "Principles of Church Government," 498
- Congregationalists*, modern pulpit ministrations among, 357
- Conybeare* and Howson, Rev. Messrs., their "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," reviewed, 63
- Cortes*, notices of, 542, 547
- Cowper*, his description of a Preacher, 371
- Cumming*, Dr., defects of, as a writer and speaker, 369—works of, reviewed, 579
- De Sauley*, M., quoted, 165—researches of, in Palestine, 167
- Dryden*, poetry of, 238
- Ellis*, Mr., his work on Madagascar quoted, 41, 43
- Emigration*, progress and influence of, in America, 267
- England* under Henry VIII., 501—transitional periods, 502—style of education, 504—public schools, 507—low tone of clerical character, 509—Henry's jealousy of the Reformation, 511—unsettled state of religious opinions, 513—Grafton and Coverdale's Bible, 515—suppression of monasteries, 517—counterfeit relics, 519—abatement of old superstitions, 521—Lady Mary, 523—sports of the King, 524—submissiveness of the Parliament, 525—a contested election, 526—defective administration of justice, 527—domestic life, 529—correspondence of Lord Lisle, 530—widows, 531—minors, 533—lack of literature, 534—general summary, 535
- Extemporaneous* oratory, advantages of, 233
- Faith*, the perfection of reason, 216
- France*, colonization of Madagascar by, 48
- Galen*, extent of his knowledge of anatomy, 424—value of his writings, 427
- German* theologians, notices respecting, 203. See *Thierach*.
- Gunnison*, Lieut., quoted on Mormonism, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 116, 120
- Hall*, Robert, mental traits of, 191
- Hamilton*, Dr. James, defects of, as a writer and speaker, 369
- Hannah*, Dr., quoted, on personal piety in Ministers, 373
- Harvey*, great discovery of, 432
- Henry VIII.* See *England*.
- Heresies*, combated in the New Testament, 5, 17, 24
- Hippocrates*, extent of his knowledge of anatomy, 414—quoted, 415, 416
- Hooker*, quoted, 478
- Intuition*, remarks on, 199
- James*, Rev. J. A., his "Earnest Ministry" quoted, 354, 360, 361
- Jay*, Rev. W., tribute to the memory of, 358—Wallace's Portraiture of, 580
- Kidder*, D. P., quoted on Mormonism, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 116, 120
- Landor*, W. Savage, poetry of, 243, 289
- Law*, John, and the Mississippi scheme, 398
- Lawson*, Mr., of Bath, meteorological researches of, 128
- Litton*, his "Church of Christ," reviewed, 459
- Longfellow*, Professor, poetry of, reviewed, 450
- Louis Philippe*, the late, sketch of his history, 408. See *Orleans*.
- Lowell*, J. R., poetry of, reviewed, 446
- Lynch*, Lieut., quoted, 161, 163
- Macaulay*, Right Hon. T. B., Speeches of, reviewed, 566
- McNeile*, of Liverpool, characteristics of, as a preacher, 351, *note*
- Madagascar*, its geographical position and extent, 39—origin of the name, 39—predominant races, 41—religion, 42—mental qualities, 43—population, 44—form of government, 44—customs and manners, 45—civil arts and commerce, 46—language, 47—early history, 47—French attempts at colonization, 48—becomes a British dependency, 52—Radama, 53—abolition of the slave-trade, 53—establishment of a mission, 53—its influence, 54—death of Radama and succession of Queen Rananalona, 55—persecution of Christians by the Queen, 55, 59—design upon Ramanalaha defeated, 56—policy of the Queen, 57—neutrality of the British Government, 58—appeal of the native Christians, 58—the Queen resigns the Government to her son, 59—renewed encouragement to Missionaries, 60—mission of Mr. Ellis, 61—commercial prospects, 62—duties of the British Government, 62—communication from Mr. Ellis, 63
- Malte-Brun*, quoted, 47, *note*
- Melville*, of London, characteristics of, as a Preacher, 351, *note*
- Meteorology*, its progress and practical applications, 127—had its origin in astrology, 128—Morin's six articles, 129—



- establishment of the first Meteorological Society, 130—the Society of the Palatinate and its Transactions, 131—the system organized by Quelet, 132—terrestrial magnetism, 133—aurora borealis, 136—activity and extent of meteorological observations, 137—Professor Daniel's "Researches," 138—the province of the science, 139—influence of atmospheric changes on life, 143—influence of cycles on supply of food, 145—periodic sun-spots and meteors, 147—connexion of magnetic and volcanic agencies, 148—meteorology, in connexion with geography and astronomy, should be a part of education, 149
- Milton*, as a polemic and a poet, 214—poetry of, 242, 244, 252
- Mormonism* and the Mormons, 95—California, the location of the Mormons, 96—discovery of the "Book of Mormon," 98—alleged evidences of authenticity, 100—Smith's duplicity, 102—true origin of the "Book of Mormon," 104—pretended translations, 106—organization, and mission to the Indians, 107—mercantile speculations, 108—disasters, 109—settlement of the sect at Nauvoo, 110—murder of the "Prophet," 111—specimens of Mormon "morality," 112—the "Prophet's" successor, 113—rapid increase, 114—notions of the Trinity, 115; of faith, 116; of baptism, 117—pretended miracles, 118—discipline and polity, 120—"spiritual wives," 122—demoralizing tendency, 123—probable correctives, 125
- New Granada*, the gate of South America, 536—prospects of future progress, 537—Indian races, 539—Santa Anna, 540—religion in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, 541—Yucatan, 543—population and language, 545—products and manufactures, 547—Chamber of Legislation, 549—new Constitution, 550—Gonzalez, 551—position of New Granada towards South America, 552—Bogota, 553—products in its vicinity, 555—British Colony, 557—standing army, 558—low state of morals, 559—climate, 559—motives to settlers, 560—field for Protestant Missions, 564
- Newton*, Dr., tribute to his memory, 363, *note*
- Nicolas*, of Russia, characterized, 340. See *Russia*.
- Orleans*, the Valois and Bourbon Dukes of, 374—Philip, the first Duke, 374—Louis, 375—Dunois, the Bastard, 377—doings of the Duke of Burgundy, 378—Charles, 380—Isabella, his wife, 382—merits of Charles as a poet, 383—specimen of his poetry, 384—Louis XII., the fourth Duke, 384—Mary Tudor, 385—Henry and Charles, 387—Prince Gaston, 388—Philip of Anjou, 391—Henrietta, his wife, 392—Charlotte Elizabeth, his second wife, 394—
- death of Philip, 395—Philip the "Regent," 396—John Law, and the Mississippi scheme, 398—a French Archbishop, 399—easy morality of Rome, 401—Louis Philippe, 403—another Louis Philippe, 404—Philippe Egalité, 406—Louis Philippe, ex-King of the French, 408—the last Duke, 411—summary of the Dukes, 411
- Owen*, Dr. John, quoted on the Church, 484
- Owen*, Professor, quoted, 420
- Owen*, Rev. John, mental traits of, 191
- Palestine*, recent discoveries in, 150—its position, 151—Palestine as connected with Scripture, 152—should be the chief point of scientific interest, 153—results of modern inquiry, 155—biblical geography, 157—researches of Dr. Robinson, 157—identification of Pella, 159—Palestine described, 160—the Dead Sea and its vicinity, 161—topographical significance of Scripture phrases, 165—discovery of the "Five Cities" by M. De Sauley, 167—strictures on his claim, 167—the Bible, an independent authority of the highest kind, 172
- Paul*, St., Life and Epistles of, 63—character of the Apostle, 63—remarkable epoch of his appearance, 66—political and civil institutions of this period, 71—geography and topography of his labours, 73—his childhood and youth, 75—his death, 78—origin of the appellation "Christian," 77—spiritual gifts of the primitive Church, 79—primitive Church-order, 80—factions at Corinth, 82—false teachers at Colosse, 85—chronology of Paul's Life, 88—authenticity of the pastoral Epistles, 92—Mr. Conybeare's translation of the Epistles, 94
- Peter the Great*, despotism of, 317
- Pizarro*, notices of, 538
- Plato*, extent of his knowledge of Anatomy, 417
- Pliny the Elder*, Natural History of, 423
- Poe*, Edgar, poetry of, reviewed, 453
- Poetry*, modern, its genius and tendencies, 235—the charm of poetry, 239—prevalent errors on the subject, 240—essentials of poetry, 242—Henry Taylor and Walter Landor, 243—Tennyson, 244—egotism of modern poetry, 245—specimens of this, 246—"Life-Drama" of Mr. Smith characterized, 247—"Balder," 250—blemishes and beauties of the work, 251—its moral deficiencies, 255—Matthew Arnold's "Poems," 257
- Poets*, recent American, 440—criticism and poetry, 441—the subjective element, 443—Wordsworth and Keats, 443—genesis of American poetry, 445—James Russell Lowell, 446—poetical empiricism of the day, 447—poetic character of Mr. Lowell, 449—Professor Longfellow, 450—his "Golden Legend,"

- 450—Edgar Poe, 453—characteristics of his genius, 454
- Poland*, notices of, 312, 344—dismemberment of, by Catherine of Russia, 321
- Pratt*, Orson, quoted on Mormonism, 116
- Presbyterians*, modern pulpit ministrations of, 355
- Pulpit*, the modern British, 349—importance of the pulpit, 349—the Church of England, 351—the Presbyterians, 355—the Congregationalists, 357—the Wesleyans, 361—end of the ministry, 365—reasons of pulpit failure, 365
- Puritanism*, and its uses, 194
- Raphael*, painting of, 239
- Reason*, insufficiency of, in matters of revelation, 211—its sufficiency tested by experience, 215—faith the perfection of, 216
- Robinson*, Dr., researches of, in Palestine, 157
- Rogers*, H., quoted, on perspicuity in writing or speaking, 367
- Romanism* in America, 273
- Rome*, essay morality of, 401
- Russia*, place of, in Christian civilization, 297—Rome and Christianity, 298—gradual advance of Christian civilization over Central and Northern Europe, 300—the Merovingian period, 300—the Carolingian period, 301—evangelization of Europe, 302—conversion of Bohemia and Hungary, 306; of Lithuania, 307—the Middle Ages a training period, 309—inferiority of the Russian character, 310—Poland, 312—original state of the Sarmatians, 313—religious supremacy of the Czar, 314—despotism of Peter the Great, 317—ambition of the Russians, 319—exploits of Catherine, 321—religious tendencies of Alexander, 323—his feeble character, 325—accession of Nicolas, 326—his despotism, 328—Czar-worship, 329, 340—territorial aggrandizements, 331—Prince Menchikoff's embassy, 333—Napoleon's fifteen years' war, 334—character of the Greek Church, 335—condition of the serfs, 337—nature of the Czar's power, 339—relation of the Russians to the other Slavonians, 341—military strength of Russia, 343—the two nations of the future, 345—antagonism of England and Russia, 346
- Shakespeare*, poetry of, 239—truthfulness of, 381
- Slavery*, American, peculiarities of, 271
- Smith*, A., Poems of, reviewed, 238
- Smith*, Dr. J. P., biographic notice of, 280—tribute to his memory, 357
- South*, Dr., quoted on preaching, 370
- Spiritual* gifts of the primitive Church, 79
- Stanley*, Rev. A. P., strictures on his "Apostolic Age," 29, 84
- Steward*, Rev. G., his "Principles of Church Government" reviewed, 459
- Taylor*, Henry, poetry of, 243, 257
- Taylor*, Isaac, strictures on his remarks on Methodism, 196
- Tranquson*, poetry of, 244
- Theology*, harmony of, with science, 206
- Thiersch* as a theologian and a critic, 1—review of the discussion that called forth his writings, 1—his first work, 3—its object, 4—its beauties and defects, 10—his Preelections on Catholicism and Protestantism characterized, 12—his Irvingism, 14, 33—his refutation of Baur's sceptical theory, 15—his vindication of the Fathers unsatisfactory, 30—his "Church in the Apostolic Age," 22—defends the Pentecostal miracle, 23—his chronology of the apostolic age, 27—strictures on Stanley's "Apostolic Age," 29—absurdities in Thiersch's chronology, 30—his great defects as a critic, 32—views of ecclesiastical organization and officers, 34—Protestantism opposed to Rationalism and Materialism, 37—eminent services of Thiersch, 37
- Tractarianism* in the Church of England, 353
- Vinet*, Professor, quoted on preaching, 366; on the language of the Bible, 371
- Wallace*, Mr., quoted on New Granada, 544, 545, 554
- Wardlaw*, Dr., tribute to his memory, 358
- Watson*, Richard, his character and writings, 185—his intellectual character developed by the religious element, 186—his early history, 188—comparison with his contemporaries, 191—universality of his mind, 193—his "Theological Institutes," 197, 209—his perceptive or intuitive faculty, 199—was a philosopher, 201; and a Christian philosopher, 205—insufficiency of reason in matters of revelation, 211—his Institutes quoted on this point, 211—his character as a polemic, 213—his reasoning powers, 214—importance of his writings to Methodism, 220—his power of imagination, 221—union of Christianity and refined taste, 223—illustrative extracts, 225—his mode of conducting Divine service, 229—style and manner of preaching, 230—his figure and appearance, 234—his sensitiveness, 235—his incessant and exhausting services, 236
- Wesley*, and his coadjutors, splendid examples of preaching, 362
- Wesleyan* Methodism, not a cramped Christianity, 196—epitome of its Church polity, 493
- Wilberforce*, Archdeacon, his "Incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ," and "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," reviewed, 459
- Wolsey*, Cardinal, sketch of, 510. See *England*.
- Young*, Dr., poetry of, 255—"Complete Works" of, 295—quoted, 390
- Yucatan*. See *New Granada*.

